WHAT AFTER DEATH

L. FRANKLIN GRUBER

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 26 1926
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BT 901 .G85
Gruber, L. Franklin 1870-
1941.
What after death?

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 26 1926
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

WHAT AFTER DEATH?

An Examination of Several Theories of Future Retribution and an Exposition of the Teaching of the Scriptures as to the State of the Lost and the State of the Saved

BY
L. FRANKLIN GRUBER, D.D., LL.D.
Associate Editor, *Bibliotheca Sacra*

Author of "Whence Came the Universe?" "The Theory of a Finite and Developing Deity Examined," "The Truth About Tyndale's New Testament," "The Einstein Theory," Etc.

1925
THE LUTHERAN LITERARY BOARD
Burlington, Iowa

Copyright 1925 by
R. NEUMANN, BURLINGTON,
IOWA

FOREWORD

There is no subject that has more persistently occupied the mind of man than that of his state in the future world. "What after death?" is a question that has been raised and discussed by Jew and Gentile, by Christian and heathen, alike. It involves man's happiness not only hereafter, but even here. It implies, of course, an "after death" or that death does not end all.

So solemn a subject, one that deals with man's eternal interests, must be approached with reverence. The torch of human reason may be used to throw some light along the pathway; but only as one is led by the light of revelation can he be safe against the pitfalls of error. And, indeed, only by that divine light will the subject be sufficiently illuminated to see and understand aright some of its dark and shadowy mysteries. Nor can mere feeling or sentiment be relied upon in such an investigation. Truths and facts, not feeling, must determine conclusions; and these only in so far as they can, with some degree of certainty, be confirmed by incontrovertible arguments from the Scriptures, illustrated and enforced by reason based upon universally accepted laws.

As Holy Scripture, however, is so explicit, and as its contents should naturally be taken at what the language seems very clearly to convey, it would hardly seem necessary to discuss at any great length its teachings as to the state of the departed. Nevertheless, because of many erroneous and conflicting theories as to the same, we believe that the following fresh discussion will be welcomed.

Throughout the whole, we have aimed at perspicuity and simplicity. The subject, however, necessarily demands an occasional reference to the Greek and Hebrew texts and an explanation of terms used therein. But whenever Hebrew and Greek terms are used, they are given in English or Roman letters, for the

better understanding, by the general reader, of the points discussed.

We shall now send this book on its intended mission; namely, that of helping to correct some of the erroneous ideas as to these matters. And if, by the grace of God, it will be a means of leading honest seekers after truth to a better understanding of the teaching of God's Word on this solemn subject, and thus afford new hope and encouragement to the faithful and also prove a warning to heedless individuals, we shall consider our labors amply repaid. To this end we now commend it to the candid reader; and may the Divine blessing attend its reading to the spiritual edification of many and to the glory of the triune God.

L. F. G.

St. Paul, Minnesota,
February, 1925.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

FOREWORD 3-4

I INTRODUCTORY: WILL THERE BE RETRIBUTION AFTER DEATH? 9
I Retribution Illustrated in Nature 9
II The Testimony of the Scriptures 11
1 Evidence from the Old Testament . . . 12
2 Evidence from the New Testament . . . 13
(1) Christ's Teaching on the Subject in Parables 14
(2) Christ's Direct Teaching on the Subject 15
(3) Other New Testament Evidence . . 17
3 Terms Used 17
(1) Sheol 18
(2) Hades 21
(3) Gehenna 23

II ANNIHILATIONISM: WILL THE WICKED BE UTTERLY DESTROYED? 27
I Philosophic Annihilationism—A Preliminary Consideration 28
A Materialistic Theory (Haeckel) . . . 28
B Pantheistic Theory (Hegel) 29
II Penal Annihilationism 30
1 Conditional Immortality 31
(1) The Soul an Entity Distinct from the Body, Its Necessary Organ of Operation 31
(2) The Soul But a Function of the Physical Organism 35
2 Annihilationism Properly So Called . . . 37
(1) Reasoning of Annihilationists Fallacious 40
(2) Teaching of the Scriptures as to Death and Destruction and Continued Existence 42
A Death Primarily a Separation . . 44
B Both the Righteous and the Unrighteous to Share in the Resurrection and the General Judgment 45
C Both to Be Consigned to Abodes for Continued Being . . . 45
D Continued Being of Both Equal in Duration 45
E To Both, Continued Being a Conscious One 46
(3) Continued Existence in Punishment Not Inconsistent with God's Love . 48

III Psychopannychism: Is the Soul Asleep between Death and the Resurrection? 51
I Alleged Scriptural Evidence for Psychopannychism Not Applicable 51
1 Passages That Speak of the Dead as *Asleep* . 51
2 Passages That Speak of the Dead as *at Rest* . 53
II Other and Direct Evidence of Scripture Against This Theory 55
III Psychopannychism Based upon False Premises as to the Nature of the Soul 58
IV Probationism: Will there Be an Offer of Salvation after Death? 61
I Theory of Future Probation for the *Heathen* groundless 61
1 Reasoning of Exponents of Theory of Future Probation for the Heathen Fallacious . . 63
2 The Question of a "Fair Chance" Considered 67
II No Future Probation for Those Who Die *Impenitent* 70
1 Failure of Supposed Scripture Proofs to Prove This Theory 72
2 This Theory Directly Disproved by Scripture 77
3 Evidence from the Element of Fixedness in Character 82
V Purgationism: Is the Doctrine of Purgatory Tenable? 85
I Authoritative Statement of the Doctrine . . . 85
1 As Given in Earlier Official Documents . . 85
2 As Given in Later Approved Works . . . 88
I Brief History of the Doctrine 90
III Rome's Direct Proofs for the Doctrine and Our Answer 92
IV Rome's Arguments from Her Associated Doctrines Equally Groundless 107
1 Human Satisfactions, Penance, Good Works, Works of Supererogation 107
2 Indulgences, the Power of the Keys, Confession, Papal Infallibility 113
3 Prayers for the Dead 130
V Direct Evidence of Scripture against the Doctrine of Purgatory 132
VI Universalism: Are All Men Finally to Be Saved? 141
I Brief Outline of Its History 141
II Its Forms 143
III Its Basis 143
IV Arguments in Defense of Universalism Considered 145
1 Argument from God's Goodness . . . 145
2 Argument from Christ's Atonement . . . 156
3 Argument from the Omnipotence of God . 161
4 Argument from Supposed Philosophic Necessity 167
5 Argument from the Justice of God . . . 168

6 Argument from Supposed Sympathy of the Saved with the Lost 171
7 Argument from the Very Nature of Scripture upon This Point 172
8 Argument from History and Tradition . . 174
V Universalism Further Disproved by Its Groundlessness and Inherent Weaknesses 180
1 Universalism in Conflict with Both Consciousness and Scripture 181
2 Concessions of Its Exponents 182
3 Moral Dangers Involved in the Theory . . 185
4 Its Fundamental Fallacies 191

VII Eternalism: Will Future Punishment Be Endless? 195
I Phenomenal Nature of Language Considered . 195
II Current Jewish Belief and the Teaching of Scripture 200
III Objections Answered 206
A That Eternal Life and Eternal Death Have Reference to Quality Rather than Duration 206
B That Endless Punishment Would Be in Conflict with both God's Mercy and Justice . 207
C That the Number of the Lost Would Be Too Great 208
D That the Happiness of the Saved Would Be Marred if Some Were Eternally Lost . . 208
E That Eternal Death Means Eternal Non-Existence 209
IV Eternity of Punishment Logically Necessitated by Other Doctrines 212
A To Minimize the Greatness, or to Shorten the Duration, of Future Retribution, Is to Minimize the Greatness of Sin . . . 212
B To Minimize the Greatness of Sin Is to Minimize, or Even to Deny, Christ's Sacrifice for Sin 215
C To Minimize Christ's Sacrifice for Sin Is to Minimize the Greatness of His Person . 217
D To Attempt to Shorten the Duration of Future Retribution Is, therefore, to Deny Christ's Deity 219

VIII The Nature of Future Punishment: What Is the State of the Lost? 220
I Elements of a Negative Nature 221
II Elements of a Positive Nature 223
1 Objective 224
(1) Expressions or Terms Used . . . 224
(2) Meaning of These Terms 225
2 Subjective 227

IX The Nature of Future Blessedness: What is the State of the Saved? 231
I No Intermediate State of Unconsciousness . . 232

II More Direct Knowledge and Better Understanding 234
III Future Recognition and Fellowship 235
IV Satisfying Activity and Consequent Development 237
V The Glory of the Redeemed 238
VI Different Degrees of Glory 240
VII Heaven a Place, as Well as a State 241

INDEX 245-253

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

WILL THERE BE RETRIBUTION AFTER DEATH?

It may truthfully be said that everything is governed by law. Indeed, what is law but the expression of the will of God? Thus all laws are meant for the carrying out of His righteous purposes.

I RETRIBUTION* ILLUSTRATED IN NATURE

The whole of external nature, even to its last detail, illustrates this universal government by law. And this is true also of our own beings. Thus bodily pain and pleasure, and misery and happiness of mind or soul, are governed by law. Pain and misery are the imposed penalties for direct or indirect transgression of law, as pleasure and happiness are normally the rewards for obedience. Indeed, it may be said that law governing man implies also possible transgression, and has, therefore, necessarily associated with it the idea of rewards and punishment. Thus that punishment inerrantly follows any transgression or breaking of the laws of nature, is a fact that is so patent as to be almost instinctively recognized. Even to the little child this law manifests itself on attempting to touch a hot stove with unprotected fingers. Nor is there any forgive-

*Although the term *retribution*, in its wider theological sense, includes both punishments and rewards, it is used rather in the narrower sense of punishments in this chapter.

ness of such transgression of nature's laws, except what may be afforded by the laws of healing and restoration in our own beings.

That life here is thus governed by law with associated rewards and punishments, no one will deny. And if government by law is universal, it must include the psychical and spiritual spheres, the future as well as the present. As human personality continues its identity, so must the possibility of misery extend beyond this sphere as really as does the possibility of blessedness.

The belief in future punishment is held by practically all nations and races, and is, therefore, probably a moral instinct associated with an accusing conscience. And this universality of belief, or moral instinct, cannot easily be set aside even by the disbeliever in the Christian Scriptures, as it unmistakably implies an objective reality.

To object that such punishment could not be possible on the part of a merciful God, and that surely He could and should have created the universe so as to preclude such a possibility, is to presume to know all God's infinite purposes in creation. It is furthermore to pass judgment on what He should have done, rather than to accept His own unmistakable revelation (to be set forth later), and His created universe for very plain illustration, that punishment awaits the wicked in the future world. Indeed, such future punishment is just what we should expect from a perfect Being. To love righteousness is to hate evil; and the punishment of the evil doer is implied in divine mercy to the penitent. And that such punishment is just, our own consciences clearly testify.

In line with what we have said above are the

following emphatic words of Dr. Austin Phelps: "Though it [the doctrine of future punishment] is the doctrine of the Book, yet we do not depend for it on the Book alone. We depend on the nature of the mind of God for its groundwork; on the moral forces of the universe for its auxiliaries; on every prophetic menace of a human conscience for its confirmation; on the moral sense of every new-born child for proof that it *will* come direct and fresh from God, to the end of time; and on the analogies of human law for assurance that moral government can exist nowhere without its majestic and imperative working. The religious beliefs of mankind never can break loose from such underground anchorage, in the nature of things. That is a very sure thing in the destiny of one world, which has the moral gravitation of all worlds flanking it on every side to hold it in position. A moribund theology! Is the north star moribund?" *(My Study and Other Essays,* pp. 51-52.)

Thus even from nature, including man's own being, many arguments might be drawn to show not only that the righteous will be blessed hereafter, but also that the unrighteous will be punished. But as the word of God plainly declares such punishment beyond the grave to be a solemn reality, it is hardly necessary for our purpose to develop this line of argument any further, at least at this point of our discussion.

II THE TESTIMONY OF THE SCRIPTURES

The whole of revelation with its unfolding plan of salvation implies the reality of future punishment. Why would it have been necessary for the Son of God to come to this earth, indeed why any method of salvation and even any revelation, if there would be no

punishment after death? No, this is presupposed in virtually every warning of the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation.

Of the vast amount of Scripture evidence that might be cited, both from the Old Testament and from the New Testament, in proof of future punishment, we shall now proceed to give a few of the most important points.

1 EVIDENCE FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

As already stated, all the many warnings of Scripture, with which the Old Testament abounds, imply impending punishment. But its reality is also explicitly taught in a number of places. Some passages, such as, "The wicked shall be turned back unto Sheol, even all the nations that forget God" (Ps. 9:17), could not be explained in any other way. The term *Sheol* here cannot mean death or the grave, or even merely the place of departed spirits, as has been contended; for then the passage would be equally true of the righteous and of those nations that do not forget God. Very emphatic also are the following words: "Though hand join in hand, the evil man shall not be unpunished . . . the expectation of the wicked is wrath" (Prov. 11:21-23). And very explicit are the words of Daniel 12:2: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." See also Numbers 32:23; Job 31:30; Psalm 1:5-6; 11:6; 16:17; 49:72; Proverbs 13:15; Ecclesiastes 11:9; 12:14; Isaiah 5:24; 33:14; 66:15; Ezekiel 18:4. Many other Old Testament passages in which the reality of future punishment is more or less clearly taught or implied might be cited,

but, as the New Testament is the inspired exposition of the Old Testament and as its teachings are more explicit, it is hardly necessary to do so.

Thus from the account of man's expulsion from Eden to the prophet Malachi, the reality of future punishment underlies the Old Testament, becoming clearer as the time of the coming of man's Saviour draws nearer and nearer. The Old Testament is indeed not as clear as the New Testament; but this is in accordance with the very nature of revelation, which is consistently progressive.

Moreover, although the Apocryphal Books must not be quoted as inspired Scripture, even they are not without their testimony on this subject, as they at least mirror Jewish belief of their time and general Jewish interpretation of Old Testament teachings on the subject. See Judith 16:17; 2 Maccabees 12:43-46; *et al.* Indeed, as is abundantly evident, the reality of future punishment was part of Jewish belief throughout their history. And this was not less the case at the time of our Lord than during any other period, if we except the sect of Sadducees, who virtually denied the existence of the spiritual world.

2 EVIDENCE FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

Coming now to the New Testament, we note that nowhere did Christ sanction Sadduceeism, nor did He ever attempt to gainsay the otherwise generally accepted Jewish belief in future punishment. On the contrary, He repeatedly spoke in unmistakable terms about it, and, in fact, as of a reality that is so fundamental as to need no proof. As Christ did not attempt to prove the existence of God the Father, which is fundamental to all other things, but only

further revealed Him, so He did not attempt to prove the reality of the future world and of future punishment.

(1) Christ's Teaching on the Subject in Parables

So important did Christ consider this doctrine of future punishment that He was never more emphatic than when He spoke on this and kindred subjects. Indeed, He devoted to it more parables than to any other doctrine. Note the force of His words in the *parable of the tares:* "The harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are angels. . . . The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth" (See Matt. 13:24-30; 36-43). Not less emphatic is He in the *parable of the drag-net:* "So shall it be in the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth" (See Matt. 13:47-50). Other parables of similar import might be cited, such as that of the *marriage-feast* (Matt. 22:1-14), and those of the *ten virgins* and the *talents* (Matt. 25:1-30). And, surely, every one, whether he considers the passage a parable or not, remembers Christ's explicit declaration about the rich man: "And in Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments . . . And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am in anguish in this flame," etc. (Luke 16:19-31).

Some men object, however, that these are only parables; but they forget that the truth presented is not in the least lessened thereby. Indeed, Christ did not teach by parables to soften the truth but rather to make it more intelligible, as these solemn things of the spiritual world can, in their real essence, be described only in parable, or in the metaphorical terms of the language of this world, as we shall show in our chapter on *Eternalism.* Such things can best be taught by illustration, but all illustrations must be true to the real nature of things, or must really *illustrate* the truth.

(2) Christ's Direct Teaching on the Subject

It is, however, not only in parables that our blessed Lord plainly taught the reality of future punishment, but He frequently did so also *directly,* while He often clearly implied it.

In sending out His disciples He charged them thus: "And be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28). Nor is there any ground for the contention that the word *hell (Gehenna)* here means only the *grave.* If it meant only the *grave,* then the righteous would receive the same punishment as the unrighteous, as the grave is common to both. Indeed, the very contrast between the killing of the body and the destroying of both soul and body in hell, is meant to show that the latter is much more terrible than the former. And as the killing or death of the body already involves the grave, the destroying of both soul and body must involve more; and, therefore, *hell (Gehenna)* cannot mean the *grave.* The infinite power of God in

destruction beyond the grave is contrasted with the little power of man in bodily killing and bringing to the grave. The terms *death* and *destruction* will be explained in the next chapter. Equally groundless is the contention that the word *hell* here means annihilation in what is called "the second death," as we hope conclusively to show under *Annihilationism.* Indeed, as will presently be explained more fully, the world *hell (Gehenna)* can here refer to nothing else than the place of punishment beyond the grave—even beyond the resurrection and general judgment—for the punishment is to be shared by soul and body.

Very emphatic also are the Master's words in His account of the last judgment: "Then shall the King say also unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life" (Matt. 25:31-46). See also Matt. 5:20-22; 7:22-23; Mark 10:43-48; Luke 13:24-28.

Thus He who brought life and immortality to light, spoke of the punishment of the wicked in just as unmistakable terms as He did of the blessedness of the righteous. And this He did both *in parable* and *directly.* Thus in the parable of the *ten virgins,* the five foolish virgins are just as truly shut out as the five wise virgins are admitted; and in His account of the last judgment, those on the left hand just as truly depart into everlasting punishment as those on the right hand go into everlasting life.

(3) Other New Testament Evidence

The apostles, who were under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit, were no less explicit upon this subject. Thus St. Paul speaks of "punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord, and from the glory of his might" (2 Thess. 1:6-9). See also 2 Cor. 5:10-11; Heb. 10:26-31.

Very emphatic also are the words of Revelation 14:9-11: "And another angel, a third, followed them, saying with a great voice, If any man worshippeth the beast and his image, and receiveth a mark on his forehead, or upon his hand, he shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is prepared unmixed in the cup of his anger; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment goeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day and night, they that worship the beast and his image, and who so receiveth the mark of his name." See also Revelation 20:10-15; 21:8.

3 TERMS USED

It is important also to add something in explanation of several terms used in various Scripture passages on this subject, because these have been made the chief battle-ground by those who have attacked this doctrine. The history of these terms in their development they have often wilfully ignored. Thus they have failed to distinguish between primary and derived meanings of terms.

In general, words may be regarded as the vessels of ideas. Their contents vary with the age in which they are used or by which they are filled, even as also

they differ in their contents to different individuals. Thus the unqualified word *law* means a different thing to the scientist from what it means to the attorney, and to both it means much more than it means to the uninitiated. So the ideas conveyed to the father and his five-year-old son, by the words *business, travel,* and almost every other similar term, are very different indeed. But as the son grows to manhood the ideas conveyed are likely to approach ever more and more those of his father.

This growth of ideas conveyed by various terms can not be ignored in such considerations. Thus the primary meaning of death was very different from various derived meanings that might be cited. The death of a man and the death of his pet schemes are very different things. Similarly might we speak of many other terms. Therefore, to read into Scripture the same meaning when it speaks of physical death as when it speaks of the death of the soul, can have no weight in the objector's argument. Such arguing is as absurd as it would be to contend that the Spirit of God is the same as the wind; because such was the primary meaning of the Hebrew word *ruach* and the Greek word *pneuma,* which were used by the inspired writers for the *Spirit.* Indeed, these writers always made use of such terms as they found at hand, and, placing them in new settings, or using them metaphorically, they made them express the transcendental ideas of the spiritual world. But upon this point more will be said under *Eternalism.*

(1) Sheol

The Hebrew word *Sheol* is generally understood to have originally meant a cavity or a *hollow,* from a root meaning *to make hollow.* From this it came to

mean *a subterranean place,* and hence *the underworld:* and later it was used more specifically for *the place of future punishment.* It is, therefore, used in the Old Testament to express somewhat different ideas at different times or in different connections, which ideas can, in most cases, be determined from the context. Young cites thirty-one places where, in the *Authorized Version,* the word *Sheol* is translated *hell,* and an equal number of places where it is translated *grave,* and three places where it is translated *pit.* We are here referring to the *Authorized Version* as to one still quite commonly used.

In most places where translated *grave* it more or less vaguely means what we understood by this term (Gen. 42:38; 44:29 and 31; *et al.*). And where translated *hell,* it is in some instances used in a somewhat general way of the unseen world, or of the place of departed spirits, though often involving the idea of punishment; and sometimes it is more definitely used of the place or state of future punishment, as, for example, in Psalm 9:17. But it must be emphasized that wherever this word *Sheol* is used in the Old Testament, whether for the place of future punishment or simply for the unseen world in a general sense, or for the grave, it always carries with it the idea of darkness or evil. Its idea is that of a place of destruction, or one with which destruction is associated (See Job 26:6; Prov. 15:11; 27:20). Therefore, even the Christian shrinks from the grave.

Its use for the *grave* is only natural, because sin is the cause of death, making the *grave* and *hell* the two abodes of punishment, the one for the physical body and the other more especially for the soul. And although the *person* is spoken of as being in *Sheol*

where it is used for the grave—a fact that has been urged as an objection by some materialists and by those who hold to the sleep of the soul with the body during its death—yet it is only the body that is there, as is clear from Ecclesiastes 12:7: "The dust returneth to the earth as it was: and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it." Even the Saviour speaks as about to be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth (Matt. 12:40), and yet during that time He promised to meet the thief on the cross in Paradise (Luke 23:43). Indeed, the soul is often spoken of for the man, as the man or person is spoken of for the body.

It should also be noted that where *Sheol* is used more definitely for what we understand as a place of punishment, it is used for the abode of the wicked, and that as a warning, as in Psalm 9:17: "The wicked shall be turned back into Sheol, even all the nations that forget God"; Proverbs 5:5: "Her feet go down to death; her steps take hold on Sheol"; etc. To say that the wicked go down to, or are turned into, Sheol (hell), implies that, in this sense of the word *Sheol* (place of punishment for the soul), the righteous do not go down to *Sheol.*

To argue against future punishment, therefore, by trying to explain away the term *Sheol* as meaning merely the grave, is totally to ignore the difference between various uses of this term, which a little examination would make very evident. It is true that the translation of the *Authorized Version* cannot be defended *in all cases* as the most accurate and explicit, yet careful examination, in the light of contexts, shows it to be in the main correct (See terms *grave, pit* and *hell* in Young's Concordance). The *Revised Version.*

American Standard Edition, simply carries over into the English translation the original word *Sheol.* And this would be all right, if that term were universally understood, and if all readers considered it in the light of contexts. But as this is not the case, it thus unfortunately furnishes the occasion for various misinterpretations.

(2) Hades

The word *Hades* also has various uses. Etymologically it means *the unseen,* and therefore *the invisible world.* In the Greek classics it is used of *the place or state of the dead,* and in the Septuagint it is used as a translation of the Hebrew word *Sheol,* and therefore has several different meanings, as is noted under *Sheol* above.

This old and then well-known word was used by Christ and the apostles for a rather more definite idea. It is thus always used in the New Testament of a place with which terror is associated, and in some instances it is clearly used for a place of retribution, as in the case of the rich man, who opened his eyes in Hades, a place of anguish (Luke 16:23-24). In Matthew 11:23 and Luke 10:15, it is a place the very opposite of heaven, and therefore a place of punishment. And in Matthew 16:18 it is clearly used figuratively for the realm or power of Satan, as follows: "And the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it [the Church]." In only one place in the *Authorized Version* (I Cor. 15:55) is it translated *grave,* but here the word, in the oldest and best manuscripts (followed by the *Revised Version*), is not *Hades* but *thanatos* (death). Thus in ten places in which it is found in

the *Authorized Version,* it is translated *hell* (See Concordance).

In Revelation 20:13-15 we read: "And the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and Hades gave up the dead that were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death, even the lake of fire. And if any was not found written in the book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire." From this it is clear that, as the sea and the grave gave up the bodies, so Hades gave up their souls, for judgment. And although the language is figurative, it thus appears that the *Hades* of the lost no less than the graves of their bodies will, at judgment, be superseded by *the lake of fire. Hades,* therefore, seems to be used of the place of the punishment of the lost soul between death and the resurrection of the body, after which the reembodied soul will be consigned to *the lake of fire,* the final *hell* or *Gehenna* of eternity, for body and soul. Thus Christ says, "And be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28), using the word *Gehenna* (translated *hell)* of this place of punishment for body and soul.

Thus *Hades* is undoubtedly used in the New Testament for the place of the disembodied spirits of the unrighteous between death and the resurrection, as Abraham's bosom or paradise is used for the place of the disembodied spirits of the righteous. *Hades* in the New Testament, as also *Sheol* in the Old Testament, is not divided into two parts, the one for the blessed, called *Elysium* and the other for the lost, called *Tartarus.* This was indeed the conception of

heathen mythology, but the inspired writers did not so use the term *Hades*. There is, therefore, no intermediate state or place that is common to spirits of both the saved and the lost, according to both the Old Testament and the New Testament. As already said, the two abodes of the blessed and the lost respectively between death and the resurrection, according to the New Testament, are *Paradise or Abraham's Bosom* and *Hades*. And in how far these are identical with the final heaven and hell (*Gehenna*), is not revealed; but it must be evident that the state of punishment or of blessedness will not be complete until after the resurrection of the body and its reunion with the soul, that is, in the post-judgment heaven and hell (*Gehenna*) of Scripture. We are told, however, that the blessed in Paradise are where God or Christ is, as Christ said to the thief on the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43); and as Paul so definitely says that "to be absent from the body" is "to be at home with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:8); and as is seen from other passages that might be cited, if necessary for our purpose.

(3) Gehenna

To the south and west of Jerusalem there was a deep rocky ravine, which for centuries was known as the *Valley of Hinnom*. At the southern brow of the eastern extremity of this valley, Solomon erected high places for Moloch, where, under Ahaz and Manassah, Children were offered to this idol. This valley, therefore, later came to be so hated by the Jews that they used it as a common cess-pool for the city. There, perpetual fires were kept up for whatever of the de-

posits was combustible, especially such as bones of criminals.

The Greek form of the name of this valley, *Gehenna* or *Geenna,* as it came to be called, from its ceremonial defilement and from its ever-burning funeral piles, was used metaphorically to denote the place of the condemned. For this our Saviour used it ten times in Matthew, three times in Mark, and once in Luke. Thus in Matthew 10:28 He says, "Rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (*Gehenna*). Indeed, with the exception of James 3:6, this word *Gehenna* is used by the gentle Jesus alone. And no one should attempt to explain away these solemn uses of the word by the Master Himself. The distinction between the use of *Hades* and *Gehenna* has already been given.

We might also speak of other terms or expressions used for future punishment, but such consideration is hardly necessary for our purpose. It should, however, be said that in 2 Peter 2:4, the word *tartarasas, cast down to hell (Tartarus),* is used, but evidently of the fallen angels alone, who are there reserved unto the final judgment.

Enough has now been said, we believe, to show that all attempts, on the part of those who deny the reality of future punishment, by trying to explain away or to weaken the force of the terms used in Scripture on this subject, are utterly valueless as arguments in proof of such contentions.

But there are several well-defined theories as to the fate of evil doers. And, as in the case of some other conflicting theories, all are professedly based upon the Scriptures. Of these theories there are five that deserve careful and somewhat thorough exam-

ination. For the sake of uniformity in nomenclature, these may be called *Annihilationism, Psychopannychism, Probationism, Purgationism* and *Universalism.* Under these terms, in their order, we shall therefore consider them, while under the term *Eternalism* we shall give in outline the unmistakable teaching of the Scriptures upon this solemn subject, followed by a brief discussion of the much-debated nature of future punishment. Then after this consideration of the state of the lost in the future world, we shall consider the blessedness of the saved.

CHAPTER II

ANNIHILATIONISM

WILL THE WICKED BE UTTERLY DESTROYED?

There are some who hold that the future punishment of the wicked consists either in being left, according to a Divine plan or law, spontaneously to pass out of existence, or in being blotted out by the external power of God.

To those who are unwilling to accept either the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked or the theory of the certain salvation of all, this theory appeals very strongly. Indeed, the origin of this theory may be said to be traceable to a reaction against these two positions. Among those in England who have held this theory in some form have been the celebrated philosopher John Locke (d. 1704), and Archbishop Whately (d. 1863). In Germany, too, there have been eminent exponents of the theory of annihilationism, among them the philosophic theologian, Rothe (d. 1867). But its adherents, both in England and on the continent, as well as in America, have been, and are today, comparatively few; and this is emphatically the case among theologians and philosophers of first rank.

Before we consider, however, the supposed blotting out, or the passing out of existence, of the *wicked* as a *punishment,* we shall briefly examine what might be called *philosophic annihilationism,* as this, to a cer-

tain extent, forms the foundation of the theory or theories which we shall discuss more at length.

I PHILOSOPHIC ANNIHILATIONISM—A PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION

A The pure materialist of the Haeckelian school holds that *all* men pass out of existence at death. According to him, the so-called soul, or the life, must cease to exist upon the dissolution of the body, though not as a punishment. Some eminent men have confessedly held this theory, among them Buechner, Fuerbach and Moleschott. But, as we should like to show more fully, if space permitted, this view is founded upon a philosophically and Scripturally false conception of the soul; namely, that what is called the soul is but a function of the brain, or at least of the bodily organism.

That the soul is not a function of the physical organism, is very clear from the account of man's creation, Genesis 2:7: "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." And, surely, nothing could be plainer on this point than the words of Ecclesiastes 12:7: "The dust returneth to the earth as it was: and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it." That the soul is an entity different from the body, is not only directly and explicitly taught in such passages as the above, but it is also everywhere else implied in Scripture. Indeed, this is generally assumed as so axiomatic and fundamental to everything else pertaining to man as to need no proof. We shall, therefore, not multiply Scripture quotations on this point; and this seems all the more

unnecessary, as the best results of modern psychology, as well as those of the physical sciences, confirm this teaching of Scripture (a point developed in the author's *Creation Ex Nihilo,* Chapters II and III). As, therefore, the materialist's fundamental assumption, that the soul is the product or function of the brain or of the physical organism, is erroneous or false, his theory of annihilationism cannot stand the application to it of science any more than that of Scripture.

B The pantheist of the Hegelian school, who regards the so-called soul as only the individualized isolation of part of the general soul or universal whole, naturally holds that into this the soul is again merged or absorbed at the death of the body. The individuality, or personal identity, of *all* men is thus said to be equally lost, and therefore also without involving any idea of punishment. Associated with this form of what we are calling *philosophic annihilationism,* are such great names as Fichte, Strauss and Spinoza. But this view, to say the least; namely—

> "That each, who seems a separate whole,
> Should move his rounds, and fusing all
> The skirts of self again, should fall
> Remerging in the general soul,—
>
> Is faith as vague as all unsweet."

No, even personality, or our innate consciousness of personal identity, in no uncertain intimations suggests that

> "Eternal form shall still divide
> The eternal soul from all beside."
>
> (Tennyson: *In Memoriam*)

It is hardly necessary for our purpose further to answer these two forms of the theory of annihilationism, as they are in conflict even with the very consciousness, or intuitive belief, of the race. Moreover, they are purely philosophic in their nature and professedly not founded upon the Word of God, with whose every teaching on this subject, in both the Old Testament and the New Testament, they are in conflict. It may be stated, indeed, that even the most ardent defenders of philosophic annihilationism readily acknowledge that the Scriptures plainly teach the existence of the soul after death. But, of course, placing their own conclusions above the teachings of inspired prophets and apostles, they totally ignore the evidence of Scripture.

As these two views do not, however, involve the idea of *punishment,* it might have seemed unnecessary even to refer to them. But as they are partly fundamental to the theory which we shall more especially consider, and as their very absurdity or unscripturalness is already a presumptive evidence against any theory of annihilationism whatever, we believe this reference to them here not to be amiss.

II PENAL ANNIHILATIONISM

We come now to a consideration of the theory of annihilationism as supposedly applied to the *wicked* and in which therefore the idea of *punishment* is involved. Of this also we note two forms. The one is based upon the assumption that the soul is by nature mortal, whether as a product or function of the body or as a separate entity, and that it would cease to exist upon the death of the body unless its life were

supernaturally prolonged. The other form of this theory is based upon the assumption that the soul is an entity distinct from the body and is by nature immortal, and that its life would, therefore, forever continue unless supernaturally extinguished. These two forms of the theory we shall now consider under the names *conditional immortality* and *annihilationism properly so called.*

1 CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY

The exponents of the first of these forms, assuming that immortality is a superadded gift conditioned upon proper use of means in this life, hold that future punishment consists in simply withholding this gift from the wicked. This form of the theory of annihilationism is therefore generally known as the theory of *conditional immortality.* According to this theory, man is by creation a mortal being, but he may by grace become immortal, by entrance into living communion with God. This was a favorite theory with G. Kunze and Edward White. Of this form of the theory there are also several varieties.

(1) According to many of its advocates, the soul is indeed a distinct entity but the body is its necessary organ of operation. These hold that the soul, therefore, is necessarily inactive or unconscious from the time of dissolution until the resurrection; and they might therefore also be classed among psychopannychists. And, pretending to follow Scripture, they hold that both the righteous and the wicked will rise, the one to immortal life, which will then be superadded, and the other, because of the withholding of the gift of immortality, to death and extinction. Some even think that the extinction or death of the wicked

will take place gradually, or that it will take place as the result of sin or inherent sinfulness only after they have suffered their merited punishment.

Advocates of this variety of the theory of conditional immortality cite many Scripture passages in proof of their contention. Among Old Testament passages they quote Gen. 2:17: "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Therefore, as they did eat, it is held, man is now naturally mortal both in body and soul, and there can be no immortality for him except as a superadded gift. In connection with the above passage they also cite Gen. 3:4, 19, 22-24. And, as supposedly in line with their theory of man's fall, they also quote Deut. 30:15: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil"; Ps. 37:20: "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of Jehovah shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Among other Old Testament passages cited are Deut. 30:19-20; Ps. 21:4; 37:10.

So in the New Testament they pretend to find confirmation of their theory in such passages as Matt. 16:26: "For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?"; John 3:16: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life"; Rom. 7:5: "For when we were in the flesh, the sinful passions, which were through the law, wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death." Among other New Testament passages they cite Matt. 7:13-19; 13:30,

40, 48-49; Luke 13:4-5; John 3:6; 5:24, 40; 6:33-35; 8:51; 10:28; 11:25; Rom. 6:21-23; 8:6, 11, 13; 1 Cor. 3:17; 2 Thess. 1:9.

In these passages, however, without exception, the terms *death, perish,* etc., very clearly do not imply a passing out of existence, whether used of the soul or even of the body, of which they are apparently used in a few places. Indeed, these terms are used in a metaphorical or moral sense for the terrible evil that thus befalls the soul. In the case of some of these passages there is indeed a difference of opinion as to whether these terms are used of the body or of the soul. But if, or wherever, they are used of the body, they are not even applicable in any argument for annihilationism. And if, or wherever, they are used of the soul, they are used only metaphorically or analogically, physical death being the basis of the metaphor or analogy. In Deut. 30:15, noted above, *life* and *good* are associated, and so are *death* and *evil.* And as *good* is the fruit or accompaniment of *life,* so is *evil* the fruit or accompaniment of *death.* But as there could be no evil to one annihilated, since the idea of evil presupposes conscious existence, the language would be meaningless if death here meant *annihilation.* And, therefore, as in this passage *life* is manifestly a state of continued existence with its associated *good,* so also must *death* be a state of continued existence with its associated *evil.* Therefore, *death* here does not mean *annihilation* of being any more than does *life.* The other passages might be analyzed in a similar manner.

These men must not consider such passages alone, apart from their contexts, and without the light of explanatory passages that very manifestly are in direct contradiction of their contention, and therefore

conclusively nullify their arguments. Life is, indeed, existence, but it is more than *mere* existence; it is existence with the positive element of good or happiness in it. And so death, of whatever kind, is also existence; but it is existence with the negative element of evil, of unhappiness or misery, in it. And with this element of misery in it, it is existence with punishment. Thus the punishment of the future world, which is elsewhere called *death* (Rev. 20:14-15), is spoken of as being *eternal* just as truly as is *life,* as, for example, in Matt. 25:46: "And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life."

Moreover, Jesus says, John 5:24: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life." Here the believer is spoken of as being "passed out of death into life," and as already in this world to have "eternal life." He had been *dead,* but not annihilated, before—spiritually dead, dead through trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1)—but now in believing he is passed from death unto *life;* and that life is the foretaste or beginning of everlasting life. The same truth is elsewhere also clearly expressed, as in John 3:36: "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." Here also the believer is said to *have* eternal life. And the unbeliever is said not to see life, but to have the wrath of God abiding on him; and therefore, he is dead, and in that state of death he is under the wrath of God, and thus in a sense in punishment. And although thus dead—spiritually dead—he is nevertheless

physically alive and psychically existing, as is also only too manifest by his unbelief and sad resistance to the Spirit of God. Among other passages in which is taught the same truth—that death is not non-existence—are John 11:25-26; Acts 1:25; Eph. 2:1-6; Col. 2:13; 3:3; 1 Tim. 5:6; Rev. 20:10.

But as we shall develop this point as to the meaning of the words *death* and *destruction,* etc., more at length later on, it is not necessary here to attempt a demonstration of the evident meaning of these terms.

(2) According to a number of exponents of the theory of conditional immortality, even as according to pure materialists, the soul is but a function of the physical organism and with its dissolution ceases to exist. But those who at least pretend to follow Scripture, generally hold that there will be a resurrection of both the good and the evil, the evil, however, passing out of existence in a second or eternal death, and the good, in this resurrection, receiving immortality as a superadded gift. Some few, however, hold that only the good are thus raised, the evil having, from the very nature of the so-called soul, already passed into non-existence, out of which they are simply not called. And these latter are at least the more consistent in their theory. Indeed, there seems to be considerable haziness or confusion in the reasoning of all these various teachers, as the reader cannot fail to notice. But this view is plainly contrary to Christ's own declaration: "All that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life: and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of judgment" (John 5:28-29). Other passages of similar import might be cited. The resurrection, these

men, however, try either simply to spiritualize or altogether to explain away. Indeed, some advocates of other forms of the theory of annihilationism also deny or explain away the resurrection in their zeal to establish their peculiar views. But the resurrection is not thus prevented nor the soul or life annihilated.

This form of the theory of conditional immortality is not only contrary to Scripture, but it is also unphilosophic. In assuming that the soul is only a function of the body, it necessarily regards death as the end of the whole being, of both soul and body, thus making its resurrection a virtual *re-creation.* A theory of annihilationism, whose assumptions are such as to necessitate a virtual re-creation, not to speak of other inconsistencies or contradictions, to make it work, is certainly not worthy of the adjective philosophic. Not only is this implied monistic assumption as to man's being in conflict with the express declaration as to man's creation (Gen. 2:7), showing that the soul is a spiritual entity distinct from the body, but it is also equally in conflict with the declaration as to death in many places, notably in Ecclesiastes 12:7: "The dust returneth to the earth as it was, and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it." Here this distinction of soul from body is plainly taught, and it is also equally plainly stated that in the dissolution of the body the soul does not cease to exist.

But in order to give their theory at least the semblance of a Scriptural setting, its exponents incorporate into it the doctrine of a resurrection. Yet, even in this, their theory is far from Scriptural. Their teaching as to the resurrection does not at all agree with that of the Word of God. Instead of teaching a resurrection of the body and its reunion with the

soul, they make it equivalent to a *re-creation of the whole being,* which, since death, had no actual existence. According to this view, therefore, there would virtually be a new creation out of non-existence for the wicked, only to have them consigned again to the punishment of a second passing out of being, or annihilation. Indeed, this form of the theory is not only unphilosophic, but it is made up of contradictions and absurdities; and, therefore, it requires no further answer. Let the reader carefully examine the inherent weaknesses of this and all the other erroneous forms of the theory of *annihilationism* considered in this chapter, and he will see the force of our argument as a whole.

2 ANNIHILATIONISM PROPERLY SO CALLED

We have thus far considered several purely philosophic theories of annihilationism, to show that even the fundamental principles of any theory of annihilationism are erroneous, as well as that form of the theory which is more generally known by the name *conditional immortality.* We shall now examine what is more generally known by the name of *annihilationism,* or what we here designate *annihilationism properly so called.*

According to the form of the theory of *annihilationism* which, accepting the duality of man's being, assumes that immortality is by creation an inherent attribute of the soul—or *annihilationism* properly so called—the punishment of the wicked consists in annihilation, by the *external power* of God, of that being which would otherwise of itself continue to exist.

It may be said that the soul is supposed to be naturally immortal, (1) from its kinship with, or being

made in the image of, the immortal or eternal God (Gen. 1:26-27; 2:7); (2) from its *a priori* forms of thought, which transcend space and time; and (3) from the law of conservation applied to psychic energy. Other proofs for the native immortality of the soul are often given, but these are enough of the proofs generally given to show the method of argument. But, we might add, the findings of modern psychology, and the very treatment of the soul by Scripture as an everlasting entity, are equally convincing, if not stronger, proofs of its native immortality.

Postulating a naturally immortal soul, annihilationists contend that the Creator who called into being this immortal soul, must have power to destroy it. And indeed this contention, taken in itself, is true. But the soul's destruction would then have to be by a miracle as much as its creation, as absolute destruction would necessarily have to be the opposite of creation. It is held that annihilation is necessary, or else, if evil were not thus finally blotted out, both creation and redemption would prove a failure. But what do we know either of the origin or of the purpose and end of moral evil? We do not have sufficient knowledge of these transcendent things to dogmatize on so profound a subject, especially in the face of God's own express declarations in Scripture to the contrary, as already seen and as we shall yet more fully show. The question here is not as to whether God *can* thus destroy the soul (for He certainly could do so), but as to whether He *will* do so: and this the Scriptures definitely declare He will not do.

There are also several varieties of this form of the theory of annihilationism. Some hold that final extinction will follow, according to special Divine decree,

from the dire results or effects of sin upon the otherwise undying personality, while some regard it as the result of the direct act of God's power. Again, whichever of the two varieties is held, some, like Rothe and the Socinians, think that this extinction will not take place till some time after the judgment, when Divine justice will have been satisfied. Others think that it will take place some time after death, but before the resurrection of the just; and still others, that this extinction will take place at, or consist in, death itself. Those holding that it will take place at death, or at least before the resurrection of the just, of course, try to explain away the resurrection of the unjust, or altogether spiritualize the resurrection.

Thus there are various views as to this theory. And, we may say at this point, there is perhaps no great name associated with, or strictly confined to, only one form or variety of the theory of annihilationism; and therefore it is even difficult definitely to designate the position of certain writers. Indeed, none of these theories, nor any one of their forms, is so distinct from the others as not to have many elements in common with some of them. Even the *viewpoint* cannot be ignored. Hence there has naturally arisen some confusion in terminology among different writers. Our classification has, however, been necessary for intelligible treatment and is, we believe, as definite as such treatment requires.

We shall now proceed somewhat at length to consider and answer this theory as a whole; namely, *annihilationism properly so called.* And we shall endeavor to show that it is not only unscriptural but also unphilosophic.

Its exponents hold that the wicked are literally destroyed so as to cease to exist. To prove this, they quote a number of Scripture passages, such as Matt. 10:28: "And be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"; Psalm 97:3: "A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his adversaries round about"; Matthew 13:40: "As therefore the tares are gathered up and burned with fire; so shall it be in the end of the world." Other passages cited are Psalm 34:16; 37:9; 114:20; Matt. 7:13. But we need not multiply passages, especially as some of those noted under *conditional immortality* are also used by exponents of this form of the theory.

(1) Reasoning of Annihilationists Fallacious

Annihilationists apparently do not read Scripture passages in the light of other explanatory passages. They apparently fail to understand the Scriptural meaning of the terms *death* and *destruction,* or to recognize the metaphorical element in these words. Indeed, in a thing so transcending human experience and therefore above human understanding, all terms must be drawn from what is apparent and tangible. Thus physical death and destruction here are made the tangible basis or type of death and destruction hereafter, or of what is called *the second death,* or *eternal death,* as well as of *spiritual death* even here. And as death and destruction here seem to be cessation of being, these men have carried that idea over into the future world. To do so, however, is a plain *petitio principii,* as that is fundamental to the very thing to be proved. Their proof is one of analogy only, and the tangible basis of their analogy—physi-

cal death—is thus assumed to be what it is not; namely, annihilation.

To assume death and destruction here to be extinction in order to prove death and destruction hereafter to be so, is to commit intellectual suicide. Extinction in death here would make impossible another death and extinction hereafter, unless in the resurrection an absolutely new creation of being were effected. But such new creation would have to include also that of the personality, which, however, Scripture teaches, both by implication and directly, to be the same in the resurrection as that which lived in this world. Thus the Saviour said to the disciples after His resurrection, "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself" (Luke 24:39). But this point is so apparent as to require no further quotations.

Moreover, to assume physical death to be extinction for the sake of establishing their contention, is to assume without proof what can be shown both from reason and from Revelation not to be true, as already intimated and as we shall now attempt to show. Death and destruction here are not *extinction.* Even destruction of a thing by fire, of which some men make so much, is not in any sense annihilation, but only the union of its substance with oxygen, with a residuum of mineral matter, called ashes. And the resultant carbon dioxide, water and ashes together weigh exactly the same as the substance consumed plus the oxygen with which its elements entered into new combinations. Or, in other words, the object's *elements* that have thus been separated by fire are in no way changed; but they are identical, both in nature and in quantity, with those of the object before the combustion, only that they have gone into *new*

combinations. And if they could, by the power of man, thus again be brought together, the object burned would be restored to its original form.

So in death and the gradual dissolution of the body, not only are the products the same, but even the process, as if the body were destroyed by fire, only that the separation, etc., of the elements is much slower. The body's substance is, therefore, not annihilated, but it is only resolved into its elements for new combinations, or changed in its form. And the soul, which is a simple, spiritual substance, cannot even thus be resolved; but it is only separated from its dissolving tenement (2 Cor. 5:1). And as it was not originated from matter (Gen. 2:7), it is not dependent upon matter, or upon the body, for its existence. Indeed, as the natural entrance or birth of a human being into this world is not a new creation *ex nihilo* either as to body (propagation) or as to soul (traduction), but is a generation from parents, by the Divine blessing (Gen. 1:28; 5:3; *et al.*), so is death not an annihilation of the substance either of the body or of the soul but only a dissolution and transformation, or a change of their form or mode of existence. If, therefore, destruction and death *here* are not extinction of being, what becomes of the argument of these men in using them, at least by implication, to prove extinction or annihilation *hereafter?*

(2) Teaching of the Scriptures as to Death and Destruction and Continued Existence

That *death* and *destruction* in the Scriptures do not mean annihilation, can easily be proved. In most cases these terms are used only of temporal rela-

tions; and as already noted, they have different meanings in different connections. In Job 19:10 we read, "He hath broken me down on every side." If *broken down* or *destroyed* meant *annihilated,* this language would be meaningless, as Job was *alive* when he spoke these words. In Luke 9:60, Christ says, "Leave the dead to bury their own dead," thus using the word in two very different senses in the same sentence. The first word *dead* refers to men physically *alive.* In Ephesians 2:1-2 St Paul says, "And you did he make alive, when ye were dead through trespasses and sins, wherein ye once walked." These Ephesians are spoken of as having been "dead through trespasses and sins," but as having walked in that state "according to the course of this world." Thus they were *spiritually dead* while they were *physically alive.* The same is strikingly expressed in 1 Timothy 5:6, "She that giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth." So also Christ's words from the throne to the Church in Sardis are so plain as hardly to need any comment, "I know thy works, that thou has a name that thou livest, and thou art dead" (Rev. 3:1). Similarly, in many other places, *death* and *destruction,* or equivalent terms, are used of those otherwise fully alive (John 5:40; 6:53; 10:10; 1 John 3:14; *et al.*). Other passages are of similar import as to the spiritual world, as we shall see later on.

It is even plainly taught that death here is the beginning of another life hereafter. In John 12:24, He who is the Truth says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit." And in 1 Cor. 15:36, St. Paul, in his argument for the resurrection of the body, says, "Thou foolish

one, that which thou thyself sowest is not quickened except it die." Thus death is declared not to be annihilation but the birth of more abundant life. Many striking analogies from nature in illustration of this point might also be given, but we must pass on to our next pont.

A The idea involved in death, wherever and however the term is used, is that of *dissolution* or *separation.* When the term is used of natural or *physical death* it always means dissolution of the living union of man's twofold nature, or the separation of the soul from the body. Thus bodily death implies dissolution, the separation of the constituent elements from one another. In Ecclesiastes 12:7 we read, "The dust returneth to the earth as it was, and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it." This signifies that in the parting of the soul from the body, in death, the body goes to dissolution but the soul lives on. Note also Gen. 25; Ps. 31:5; Matt. 27:50; Luke 16:19-31; 23:46; Acts 7:59; 2 Cor. 5:8; 12:2; 2 Peter 1:13-14.

When the term is used of *spiritual death* it means the dissolution of the bond of spiritual union between man and his Maker, or a separation of the soul from God (Eph. 2:5; Col. 2:13; 1 Tim. 5:6). To be dead in trespasses and sins is to be spiritually dead, and implies such separation. Such an idea of separation is even involved in the statement of the father about his prodigal son, "This my son was dead, and is alive again" (Luke 15:24). When it is used of *eternal death,* or of what is called "the second death," it means a separation from God that is eternal, as St. Paul says, "Who [that obey not the Gospel] shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the

Lord and from the glory of his might" (2 Thess. 1:9). See also Revelation 2:11.

B Both the righteous and the unrighteous are said in Scripture to share in the *resurrection* and the *general judgment,* as already intimated. In John 5:28-29 Christ says, "The hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment." In Acts 24:15 we have these very explicit words, "There shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust." This is also implied in the Saviour's words in Matthew 12:36-37, "And I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." The same is taught in other passages bearing on the judgment.

C The teaching of Scripture is also explicit that both the righteous and the unrighteous will be consigned to abodes for *continued being.* In His account of the last judgment Christ says, "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life" (Matt. 25:34-46). This language is so explicit that it should preclude even the possibility of any argument to the contrary. The same is also taught in the case of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31) and in that of Judas (Acts 1:25).

D It should also be noted that the Scriptures teach that this continued being, or the future existence, of the righteous and that of the unrighteous are of *equal duration.* Indeed, the duration of this continued existence of the unrighteous is expressed in the very same terms as that of the righteous, as will be more fully seen later on. See Matt. 25:46 and other passages bearing on the subject. Therefore, if the duration of the existence of the unrighteous were limited by annihilation, then that of the righteous would be similarly limited. But if, on the other hand, the duration of existence of the righteous is unlimited, or eternal, as all readily admit, then that of the unrighteous must necessarily also be unlimited.

E This continuation of being, in the case of both the righteous and the wicked, is, moreover, a *fully conscious one,* as is clearly set forth in a number of passages, notably in those referred to above. They teach that both the saved and the lost are in a state of consciousness, and in different abodes and conditions, even between death and the resurrection of the body and its reunion with the soul, and therefore before the general judgment. That they are conscious already immediately after death is clearly taught in the immediate transition of both the rich man and Lazarus to their separate abodes (Luke 16:22-23). This is equally clear from Christ's express declaration to the thief on the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43).

Moreover, without such continuity of consciousness there could be neither suffering nor happiness to the departed, the latter of which is, however, confessedly taught in many places. And if the righteous are conscious and are happy hereafter, then, from the analogy

of Scripture and its similar treatment of both, the unrighteous must also be conscious and unhappy hereafter. To be sure, absence of consciousness to the wicked and therefore absence of suffering, before and also after the resurrection and judgment—or indeed annihilation—would be in accordance with the fond wishes of many. This is especially true of those who fear that future punishment might adversely affect them. But the belief in such absence of consciousness and of suffering does not cause them to be absent. And such belief is not only in conflict with Scripture, as already shown, but also with the analogy of nature and with the very instinct of man and his innate idea of justice.

Furthermore, if the wicked were annihilated, or deprived of all consciousness, then the punishment (if it could be called *punishment*) for all the wicked would be equal, whereas different grades of wickedness, as represented in different sinners, would in all justice require *different degrees* of punishment, as even all these men would have to admit.

Thus, both from the language of the passages cited and from their contexts, as well as from the whole analogy of Scripture, it is clear that both the righteous and the unrighteous will share in the resurrection and the general judgment; that both will be consigned to abodes, which will be separate, for continued existence; that this continued existence of the unrighteous will be equal in duration to that of the righteous; and that to both this continued equal existence will be a conscious one. And we might add, even in anticipation of our discussion under *eternalism*, that if the continued existence of the righteous is eternal, then that of the unrighteous must necessarily also be eternal.

(3) Continued Existence in Punishment Not Inconsistent with God's Love

The objection is made that the God of Scripture is love, and that, therefore, such dealings with the wicked could not be in accordance with His nature. But this would be ignoring that other truth, that the God of Scripture is just. And to deny the plain teaching of Scripture on the unmistakable justice of God and His future punishment of the wicked, would invalidate the teaching, which they use in argument, on the love of God. Indeed, instead of being contradictory, these two fundamental truths are not only perfectly consistent, but they are really complementary. The unlimited *love* of God toward that which is right and good is complemented in His very nature by His equally unlimited *hate* of that which is wrong and evil. But more of this later.

Moreover, to rule out of court future punishment on the plea of God's goodness, in the face of His express declaration, is to assume to know more about Him and His work and about His purposes in punishment than does the omniscient God Himself.

The utter weakness of this argument of the objector is seen in the fact that it would have equal weight against any suffering whatsoever, not only hereafter but even here, where we see it on every side. And this is even true of the punishment of the wicked angels, likewise clearly taught in Scripture (2 Peter 2:4; Jude 6). To attempt to brush the matter aside by saying that such punishment would involve God's dealings in inexplicable mystery, is only to attempt to dodge the question; for the existence of wickedness or of any evil whatever, is equally a mystery, as in-

deed all God's workings are wonderful and hidden in impenetrable mystery.

Having shown that the theory of *annihilationism* is not only unscriptural but also unscientific, we shall proceed to consider the theory of *psychopannychism*—the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

PSYCHOPANNYCHISM

IS THE SOUL ASLEEP BETWEEN DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION?

There is a very ingenious theory, that, upon the death of the body, the disembodied soul lapses into a state of *unconsciousness* and remains in that state until the resurrection of the body and its reunion with the soul. This theory is called *psychopannychism*, from the Greek words *psyche* (soul), *pas* or *pan* (all) and *nyx* (night), because the soul is supposed to sleep the whole night of death. This theory will be treated somewhat briefly, as some of its elements are indirectly treated in other chapters.

I ALLEGED SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE FOR PSYCHOPANNYCHISM NOT APPLICABLE

A number of passages are cited in proof of this theory, a few of which we shall quote; but we shall show that they are not really apropos.

1 PASSAGES THAT SPEAK OF THE DEAD AS ASLEEP

When about to raise the ruler's daughter, Jesus said, "Give place: for the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth" (Matt. 9:24). When about to return to Judæa to raise Lazarus, He said, "Our friend Lazarus

is fallen asleep; but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep . . . Lazarus is dead" (John 11:11-14). In closing his account of the stoning of Stephen, St. Luke adds, "And when he had said this, he fell asleep" (Acts 7:60). In his great argument for the resurrection of the dead, St. Paul writes, "Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ have perished . . . But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the first fruits of them that are asleep" (1 Cor. 15:18-20). Again he writes, "But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that fall asleep; that ye sorrow not, even as the rest, who have no hope . . . For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep" (1 Thess. 4:13-15). In Daniel 12:2 it is written, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The contention of psychopannychists is, that, as in all these passages the dead are spoken of as *asleep*, their souls must be in a state of *unconsciousness*. But such reasoning, to say the least, is very superficial. Such a conclusion is certainly not deducible from the passages quoted, as a little examination should convince the reader. It will readily be seen that in all these passages it is the body that is metaphorically spoken of for the *person*, as sleeping. Thus in Daniel 12:2, the dead are spoken of as sleeping in the dust of the earth, which, as is evident, is not the abode of the soul. Surely, "Dust thou art, to dust returnest, was not spoken of the soul."

The appearance of the body in death is so similar to its appearance during sleep that in all the literatures of the world death is often thus metaphorically spoken of as a *sleep.* And, indeed, many an orthodox minister of the Gospel thus speaks of it occasionally at funerals, without in the least meaning to endorse this theory of the sleep of the soul. As in normal sleep the voluntary activities of the body are suspended so as to give it needed rest until the awakening to fresh activities, so in death the body is, as it were, at rest from the toils of this world until the resurrection to new life and new activities.

Moreover, as is conclusively proved by the investigations of psychologists, and as is illustrated in dreams, even in sleep the mind or soul is never asleep. Even during the profoundest sleep of the body the soul is shown to be ceaselessly active; and, therefore, the soul is not dependent upon the body for its activities. So, upon its separation from the body in death, the soul, not being dependent upon the body for its activities, does not lapse into a state of sleep or inactivity.

2 PASSAGES THAT SPEAK OF THE DEAD AS AT REST

Psychopannychists also quote such passages as the following: "We who have believed do enter into that rest; even as he hath said, As I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest," etc. (Heb. 4:3); "He entereth into peace; they rest in their beds, each one that walketh in his uprightness" (Isa. 57:2); "And there was given them to each one a white robe; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little time until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, who should be killed even as they were, should have fulfilled their course" (Rev. 6:11). Among

similar other passages quoted are Rev. 14:13 and Luke 2:29.

Such rest on the part of the righteous is, however, not a state of unconsciousness, as is seen from numerous passages of Scripture, and generally from their own contexts. Thus in Rev. 6:11 those who had died for the truth are indeed said to rest for a little season, but the passage unquestionably represents them as in a state of consciousness. It is said that white robes are given unto them, but that they are to "rest yet for a little time," etc. Thus they are spoken of as resting, or waiting, while robed, manifestly implying conscious readiness. Such rest does not consist in inactivity or sleep, but it consists in a patient waiting for the great day of the Lord (Isa. 26:20; Dan. 12:12). In Rev. 14:13 we are told, "Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; for their works follow with them." Here the dead who die in the Lord are truly said to rest from their labors, but unconsciousness is not at all implied. The rest and peace spoken of in these passages is clearly one from the labors of the body and the evils of this life. For that matter, unconsciousness is a state that could not be described as *blessed* any more than it could be described as *cursed.* Both blessedness and cursedness or misery necessarily imply or presuppose consciousness. Therefore, the dead who die in the Lord will be conscious, as also necessarily will be those who do not die in the Lord.

That the blessed dead are alive in the spirit and conscious, is also clearly shown in the appearance of Moses and Elijah on the mount of transfiguration (Matt. 17:2-3). The same is also implied in Christ's

answer to the Saddusees, Matt. 22:31-32, "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are here said by the Lord to be alive. Their spirits dwell with God, though their bodies still rest in their graves of earth.

But some contend that, as St. Peter on the day of Pentecost spoke of David as not being ascended unto the heavens (Acts 2:34), therefore David could not have been alive or in conscious blessedness. But in this passage also the body, not the soul, is referred to. Christ alone in body ascended into heaven, while David as to his body was, and still is, in the grave, and as it were at rest. But in spirit, like all the dead, David was, and now is, in a state of consciousness. The body may thus metaphorically be said to sleep, or to rest, but not the soul.

II OTHER AND DIRECT EVIDENCE OF SCRIPTURE AGAINST THIS THEORY

Many passages in the New Testament either explicitly teach or clearly imply that the souls of the saved enter a state or place of blessedness, and that the souls of the lost enter a state or place of misery, even *immediately after their departure from the body.* Thus the Saviour plainly taught the immediate transition of the righteous Lazarus into a state of conscious blessedness, and that of the unrighteous rich man into a state of conscious misery (Luke 16:19-31).

Some men, like the so-called "Pastor" Russell, would, however, get rid of this passage, so manifestly against

their peculiar views, by perverting it into a mere allegory. But the absurdity of their explanation is evident to every one, especially upon reading this passage in the light of the many other passages that *unequivocally* teach the truths contained in the generally accepted interpretation of this passage. Moreover, the very realistic nature of this passage is against any allegorical interpretation of it. We shall therefore consider further answer to this objection unnecessary.

This immediate transition of the soul is also taught in Christ's words to the thief on the cross, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43). The same is also unmistakably implied in St. Paul's words, "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. . . . But I am in strait betwixt the two, having the desire to depart and be with Christ; for it is very far better" (Phil. 1:21-23). St. Paul also implies conscious blessedness in his wonderful description of his rapture into the third heaven, 2 Cor. 12:2-4, especially in verse 4, "how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." See also 2 Cor. 5:1-8. The Master taught the same truth in his last discourse to His disciples and in His high-priestly prayer (John 14-17), as well as on other occasions.

Other passages of similar import might be cited, but these are sufficient to show that the argument of psychopannychists from those passages of Scripture that speak of the dead as resting or sleeping, are valueless for their contention. Indeed, we might call attention to the fact that God is also spoken of as resting from His work of creation (Gen. 2:2); and even though many a rationalist has tried to teach that He is resting and no longer concerned about His work,

or to reduce Him simply to an unconscious force in the universe, He is the one great conscious Personality by whom all things *continue* to exist. Strikingly has the Psalmist said, "Behold, he that keepeth Israel will neither slumber nor sleep" (Ps. 121:4).

Thus the souls of the saved enter upon a state of essential blessedness immediately after death (Luke 16:22-25; 22:43; Phil. 1:21-23; *et al.*). The place of their abode in this disembodied state of blessedness is variously called *Abraham's bosom* (Luke 16:22-23), *Paradise* (Luke 23:43; 2 Cor. 12:4); but it is unmistakably a place of happiness. And, as it is where Christ is (Phil. 1:21-23), it is also appropriately called *heaven,* even though it undoubtedly is not altogether identical with the ultimate heaven of reunited soul and body, as stated in the first chapter.

And so likewise the souls of the lost enter upon a state of punishment immediately after death (Luke 16: 23-24), in a *somewhere* called *Sheol* in the Old Testament and *Hades,* generally, in the New Testament—apparently to be superseded by the *Gehenna* of eternity for reunited soul and body after the general judgment.

The soul is, therefore, clearly seen to be in a state of consciousness immediately after death. In the case of the saved it is a state of conscious blessedness; in the case of the lost it is a state of conscious misery. But the blessedness of the saved, as also shown elsewhere, is not yet the complete and perfect blessedness that the reunited body and soul will enjoy after the resurrection and the final judgment; and the misery of the lost is not yet the complete misery of soul and body after the judgment.

III PSYCHOPANNYCHISM BASED UPON FALSE PREMISES AS TO THE NATURE OF THE SOUL

Probably the source of the theory of psychopannychism may be found in a false conception of the nature of the soul, such as is entertained by many of its exponents. By starting out with the theory that the mind or soul is a function of the brain, one is logically led to the conclusion that the soul is either dead or asleep and inactive during the period of bodily death. If the soul were a function of the brain, then with the death of the body it would necessarily cease to be, at least as a *conscious* existence. But here is the fallacy; namely, that the soul is a function of the brain or a property of matter. As is not only evident from Scripture, but also from the best results of modern psychology, the soul is an entity totally different from the body. It is clearly a superadded entity, as is especially seen from Gen. 2:7, "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul;" Eccl. 12:7, "the dust returneth to the earth as it was: and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it." The same is also evident from Christ's charge to His disciples, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul" (Matt. 10:28). So also, in the Psalmist's prophecy, he clearly distinguishes between the soul of the Messiah, which is not to be left in *Sheol* and the body which is not to see corruption (Ps. 16:10). See also Acts 2:27; 2 Cor. 5:1-9; Phil. 1:20-23.

Thus the Bible everywhere, either directly or by implication, treats the soul as an entity distinct from

the body—as a spiritual substance; and therefore it is not composed of material elements, nor is it even the function of such elements of the body.

As the soul and the body are, therefore, two distinct entities, the soul is not dependent upon the body for its existence, nor even for the existence of all its functions. To say that spirit cannot act without a body is to deny that God and the angels do so act. To deny the possibility of independent action on the part of a disembodied spirit, is to assume to know better the truth about the spirit world than He whose teachings are our only unerring source of knowledge on this subject, in which teachings it is clearly and emphatically affirmed.

Thus this theory, which is so soothingly prescribed as an opiate for an accusing conscience, is shown to be neither Scriptural nor scientific. Indeed, of the five erroneous theories considered in this volume, this one is probably the weakest. That the departed are now dead or figuratively asleep, and therefore totally unconscious, according to the preachments of the late self-styled "Pastor" Russell, and some others, is therefore totally untenable as an article of faith. And yet there are many otherwise well-meaning people who easily become the unsuspecting victims of the siren songs of these subtle perverters of the truth. But it is surely not safe to forsake the pure Scriptural faith that has been sealed with the blood of many noble martyrs, for a theory altogether fanciful, Scripturally and scientifically foundationless, and propagated by men who would ruthlessly set aside the tried truth of the centuries.

CHAPTER IV

PROBATIONISM

WILL THERE BE AN OFFER OF SALVATION AFTER DEATH?

The doctrine of future punishment for the wicked is so repellent to human wish and sympathy that the idea of a future probation for the as yet unsaved has appealed strongly to many people. The belief in such a probation has, by some men, almost necessarily been associated with the perplexing question as to whether there is any possible salvation for heathen, who here have no means of knowing Christ.

We regret to say that among those who have either openly taught, or fondly believed in or hoped for, another probation, there have been many otherwise good and noble men, whose names stand high in theological science and literature. But while we admire their efforts, out of sympathy, to find in such a theory a possible mitigation or shortening of the sufferings of the lost, we can find neither any Scriptural warrant, nor any other valid argument, to establish this theory and sustain their fond hopes.

I THEORY OF FUTURE PROBATION FOR THE *HEATHEN* GROUNDLESS

The theory of future probation has perhaps most plausibly been held with reference to those (heathen)

who here have no conscious knowledge of the only Saviour and those (unbaptized children) who do not receive the ordinary means of grace. See Matthew 18:14; 19:14; 28:19; Mark 16:16; John 3:5-6; Titus 3:5-7.

The state of children dying unbaptized, however, it is hardly necessary for us to discuss. But we may say briefly that, while *we* are bound, by Christ's declaration and command, to baptism, as God's *ordinary* means of imparting the new birth, no one can affirm that *God* cannot and does not *extraordinarily,* without the means, impart the new birth to children, especially to children of believers, if baptism is neglected. To be sure, this would not strengthen the peculiar contention of those who reject baptismal regeneration or even infant baptism, for we are speaking of the *extraordinary,* not the ordinary, operation of the Holy Spirit.

And of adults who accept Christ as their Saviour, we might, in a general way, use the well-known adage, "Not the neglect, but the contempt of baptism condemns." But, surely, adults who really accept Christ as their Saviour, will not neglect baptism, much less will they despise it; for to accept Christ is to accept His *teaching.* Thus, after St. Peter's convincing and convicting sermon on the day of Pentecost, we are told, "They then that received his word were baptized" (Acts 2:41). So of the people of the city of Samaria it is said, "When they believed Philip preaching the glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12). Even Simon the sorcerer believed and was baptized (Acts 8:13). The same is said of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:36-38), of St.

Paul (Acts 9:18), and of others (Acts 10:48; 16:15, 33). But if salvation is possible where baptism has been neglected or could not have been received, it does not come during any future probation, as already intimated. And, therefore, such possible salvation would not afford any argument for this theory.

1 REASONING OF EXPONENTS OF THEORY OF FUTURE PROBATION FOR THE HEATHEN FALLACIOUS

The exponents of this theory hold that, as Christ alone is the Way, the Truth and the Life, and as, without faith in Him there can be no salvation, it would be unfair, if those who here have no opportunity to know Christ or to receive the means of grace, and therefore to be saved, would not have such an opportunity in the future world. As there is, however, no confirmation of the theory of future probation in His Word, such a contention is in effect a questioning of the wisdom and justice of the infinitely wise and absolutely righteous God Himself, as to His arrangement for man's salvation. It is a projection of limited human reason into the workings of the unlimited divine Mind. To such the words of Romans 9:20 might well be applied, "O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus?"

And yet, some men press their contention about a so-called *fair chance,* in direct conflict with God's Word, even to the point of irreverence. As an illustration we shall quote the following words of Dr. Marion D. Shutter: "It is asserted that God has the right to do with us as he chooses. We are his creatures. If he condemns us and makes us suffer forever, it is well. With all reverence, no; he has no

such right. The fact that he has brought us into this world, upon the contrary, lays him under obligations to give us somewhere, a fair chance and ample opportunity to learn his will and do it. It binds him to seek our good and only our good" *(Justice and Mercy,* p. 56). The above writer might profit much by reading the whole passage of Romans 9:14-21: "Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy. . . . Hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part of a vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" See also Exodus 33:19.

A fallacy in the reasoning of these men is that they by implication assume that equal rewards must necessarily be associated with equal privileges or opportunities. But this assumption itself is made up of two assumptions, both of which we shall show to be unfounded.

In the first place, it is a mere assumption that future rewards will be equal. It is in direct conflict with the plain teaching of Scripture, as for instance in the parable of the pounds (Luke 19:12-26), where the rewards are plainly in accordance with the faithful use of the pounds or opportunities. Among other passages that might be cited are Daniel 12:3, "They that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever;" and Matthew 19:28, "Ye [the twelve disciples] also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." See also Matthew 5:19; Luke 12:47-48.

Thus it is seen that future rewards—the glory, etc., of the blessed—based upon faithfulness, will be unequal. Unfortunately, these rewards are rather generally confounded with salvation itself and eternal life. These are the free and equal gift to all the elect as believers, because of Christ's merits, as it is written, "Not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us" (Titus 3:5-7); "God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:16). This distinction between salvation, through Christ, and the superadded rewards of faithfulness, must here be clearly kept in mind. The former in its essence is equally enjoyed by God's saints already immediately after death. The latter will be meted out upon the judgment of the reunited body and soul at the end of time, according to the deeds done in the body (Matt. 25:34-40; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rev. 22-12; *et al.*), when these deeds will have attained their full fruition. Hence, these rewards will be unequal and distinctive.

And just as future rewards will be unequal, so will the future punishments of different individuals be unequal (Luke 12:47-48; *et al.*). All the condemned are, indeed, already at the moment of death, equally lost and separated from God and all that is good, as has already been stated; and this punishment will be endless, as we shall show under *Eternalism.* But their positive punishments are said, on the day of judgment, to be meted out to reunited body and soul, according to their evil deeds (Ps. 62:12; Prov. 24:12; Jer. 17:10; Matt. 12:36-37; 16:27; Luke 10:12; 20:47; Rom. 2:6; 1 Peter 1:17; Rev. 2:23), when these deeds will have attained their full fruition. These punishments must, there-

fore, also be unequal and distinctive. But in all things it will follow from their own sinfulness and rejection of grace.

In the second place, the reasoning of these men apparently assumes equality of privileges as a normal thing in God's universal order, while perhaps nowhere and at no time are privileges of any kind whatever exactly alike. As to this life, it is certainly contrary to our own observation and experience. The health, disposition, happiness, wealth, etc., of no two individuals, not even of twins, are alike; nor are their privileges or opportunities alike. And not only is this true of natural things, but Christ has unmistakably shown it to be true also of spiritual things, and notably in the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30), according to which different talents or opportunities are given to different individuals. See also 1 Cor. 12:4-31; Eph. 4:11-12. Nor does the parable of the pounds (Luke 19:12-36), properly understood, nullify this truth.

Moreover, the assumption itself—that equal rewards must necessarily be associated with equal privileges or opportunities—made up of the above two assumptions as subject and predicate, is only an assumption, implying, as it does, that rewards and privileges must necessarily have an invariable ratio. For, just as truly as no two persons are equally talented or gifted, or have equal opportunities, so will no two persons hereafter, or even here, be *relatively* rewarded, or according to their respective talents or opportunities. No, the respective ratios between the talents or opportunities and the rewards of different individuals are different as every one must acknowledge. Thus even equal talents or opportunities in different individuals

would be followed by very different rewards; and equal rewards, if such were possible, might follow very different talents or opportunities. The rewards (or punishments) are therefore not in accordance with relative talents or opportunities, but rather with relatively faithful use (or unfaithful abuse) of them, as clearly taught in the parable of the talents.

The privileges enjoyed and the light possessed are, however, declared to be *considered* in the distribution of future rewards, as well as of future punishments (Luke 12:47-48). Thus the light and the privileges of the babe and the philosopher, of heathen and Christian, of savage and sage, will be an *element* in the final awards. But, surely, no one can justify himself with the plea that he did not have the chance of Peter, Paul or John. All will then readily acknowledge the absolute justice of the great Dispenser in His distribution of rewards and imposition of punishments.

2 THE QUESTION OF A "FAIR CHANCE" CONSIDERED

It might well be asked, What constitutes a fair chance? Perhaps the knowledge of Christ on the part of Saints Peter and Paul was, considered in an absolute sense, not so much greater than our own, or even than that of the child that has been fed only upon the milk of the Word. The difference between the capacities of a gill and an ocean is virtually the same as the difference between the capacities of a barrel and an ocean. That is, the difference between these two differences is relatively inconceivably small. So, the difference between a layman's (or even a child's) knowledge of Christ and of what lies beyond man's limited understanding, is after all much the same as

that between an apostle's knowledge of Christ and of what lies beyond man. That is, a complete knowledge of Christ would not be very much more beyond that of the average Christian than beyond that of an apostle. Indeed, at best all our knowledge of Christ, the atonement and grace, God, etc., is but fragmentary, and therefore necessarily incomplete. But this, instead of deterring us from trying to learn more about God and the things pertaining to man and his salvation, should be all the greater incentive for us to endeavor to grow daily in the knowledge of God and man. Surely, even here faithfulness is required of us. "He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much" (Luke 16:10).

We must not, however, be understood to imply that there can be salvation by knowledge. The reader will observe that we are here considering the question of a *fair chance,* which is rather generally associated with *knowledge,* especially by advocates of probationism. We are, indeed, saved by Christ through faith as the hand that appropriates Christ, although some knowledge necessarily underlies faith, as St. Paul writes, "How shall they believe in him whom they have not heard" (Rom. 10:14).

Scripture does not even make any exception to God's way of salvation—faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ. This is declared to be the one test; but the possible differences of degree with reference to which this test may be applied, no one can determine. Some light is thrown upon this point by St. Paul in Romans 2:11-16: "For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law: and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the

law; for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified; (for when the Gentiles that have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these, not having the law, are the law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them); in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my gospel, by Jesus Christ." St. Paul here argues that even the gentiles have sufficient light to render them inexcusable before the law, and thus in anticipation answers these modern objections to God's dealings with them. St. Paul here, as in other passages, recognizes not even the barest possibility of any probation beyond the tomb.

And should the Good Lord save some heathen, who in this life had no knowledge of the Saviour, it would not be well for Christians to know it, else they might fail to attempt to bring to them the message of the cross. But, surely, there is no certain foundation in the Bible for any such belief. Nor can Matthew 8:10-11 be pressed into service as a proof, as is generally done. The declaration by the Lord, "that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven," clearly refers to the future conversion of the gentiles by the apostles and their successors, as is very evident from the context. In further proof of this fact it is well also to consider such passages as Genesis 12:3; Isaiah 2:2-3; 11:10; Malachi 1:11; Luke 13:24-30; Acts 10:45; 11:18; 14:27; Romans 15:9-12; Ephesians 3:4-6.

But if God, in His infinite wisdom and providence, should have made provision for the salvation of heathen, it is clear from the whole analogy of Scripture that it would not have been to save them in a probation *after death.* It would rather have been to save them in some to us mysterious way even *here,* perhaps because of a longing on their part for a Saviour and forgiveness and a feeling of penitence—and perchance at the moment of dissolution. And then it would probably have been only in accordance with God's foreknowledge of their conscious attitude toward the ordinary means of grace, if these had come to them. And if such are saved, this would seem without the shadow of a doubt to be God's method of their salvation. But such salvation would itself be the strongest argument against any future probation whatsoever.

Moreover, such a doctrine of future punishment would even be dangerous in the light of Christ's great missionary commission. At least, to argue, as has been done and as is still being insisted upon by some, that all heathen will indiscriminately be saved, would be committing theological suicide. For, if all were saved without the ordinary means of grace, it would surely afford a plausible reason, not only to the missionary sluggard, but perhaps even to the missionary enthusiast, not to bring to them such means; as, in that event, some, rejecting them, would then ultimately be lost.

II NO FUTURE PROBATION FOR THOSE WHO DIE *IMPENITENT*

It has been held by some, that for those who die

impenitent there will be another probation between death and the resurrection and the final judgment. Indeed, according to some of these men, *all* the wicked might thus ultimately be saved. Some hold that many, and others that all, will eventually be saved after suffering punishment till the law of justice will have been satisfied. This might then, *if necessary,* be followed by another probation, which, in the light of better knowledge of their real interests, etc., it is claimed, would necessarily be improved or accepted. This form of the theory, it may be said, has some elements in common with the theory of *Universalism,* which is, of course, more inclusive than that of *probationism.*

That this form of the theory of probationism is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, is evident. The Bible always treats this life as the time of probation; and with death that probation ceases, as we are repeatedly warned in Scripture. Thus St. Paul writes, "And working together with him we entreat also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain (for he saith, At an acceptable time I hearkened unto thee, and in a day of salvation did I succor thee: behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation)" (2 Cor. 6:1-2). Other passages will be cited later, when considering this point more at length.

Indeed, there is an instinctive acknowledgment on the part of all races and classes of men everywhere alike that with death all probation for the soul will end. And therefore, as eternal interests are at stake in our attitude toward Christ here, and as the tenure of life is uncertain, so that any moment might be the last and the end of probation, probation here has truly solemn significance.

1 FAILURE OF ALLEGED SCRIPTURE PROOFS TO PROVE THIS THEORY

Adherents of the theory of future probation point for a proof of their teachings to such passages as Matthew 12:31-32: "Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come." These men, however, fail to recognize in this expression of Christ, in adding "that which is to come," the manifest emphasis He meant to lay upon the utter hopelessness of one committing this greatest of all sins. For other sins there is said to be free forgiveness to the penitent in this world; for this one there is none, not even in the world to come. No sins, it is emphatically said, are to be forgiven in the future world, and surely least of all this sin against the Holy Ghost. The Saviour thus rather emphasizes that there is no forgiveness hereafter, and therefore no future probation.

The writer is well aware of the interpretation put upon this passage by Dean Farrar, as well as by some other writers. Farrar would translate the word *aion,* in this passage, *age,* making the last clause of the passage, by his interpretation, read thus: "It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this (Jewish) age, neither in the (Christian) age to come" *(Eternal Hope,* p. XLVIII.). The word *aion* indeed primarily does mean *age,* but here, as always in such connections, it is used in contrasting the present and the future, the temporal and the eternal, this life or world

and that which is to come, and may therefore rightly be translated *world.*

If it still be contended, however, for the sake of argument, that the *future or coming age* here means the *Christian* age or dispensation as contrasted with the then present *Jewish* age or dispensation, it may be said that even with that interpretation our conclusion above is not adversely affected. Even with Farrar's interpretation it does not open the possibility of forgiveness of *any* sins in the *future world during* the Christian age any more than the forgiveness of the *special sin* generally known as the *unpardonable* one, as the Jewish and Christian ages or dispensations appertain to this world. And, of course, with Farrar's own translation, the then future or coming age would not be the period of time allotted to the life of the individual here, but it would mean the indefinite period of the Christian dispensation here till the time of judgment. And as after the general judgment even Farrar would not have held to a possible forgiveness, his own argument is turned against him in the fact that the statement is emphatic that that sin will not be forgiven in that supposed age up to the judgment, and therefore never. And our contention as to the impossibility of forgiveness of other sins after death, by this very emphatic declaration of Christ, is not in the least set aside.

Among other exponents of the theory of a possible forgiveness beyond the grave is Dr. Shutter, who, however, merely adopts the view of Dean Farrar. He even insinuates that this sin against the Holy Ghost is especially being committed by those theologians who hold to what is unmistakably the Scriptural doctrine. He says: "I should like to suggest the in-

quiry whether it is not a sin against the light of this age, against great light, for ministers to go on year after year ringing changes upon the words *everlasting* and *hell* and *damnation,* when the ablest scholars and critics of the world have shown conclusively that those terms ought not to stand in a correctly translated version of the New Testament?" *(Justice and Mercy,* p. 197). This writer even suggests that this sin might be committed by those who do not inform themselves "in regard to the position of a liberal church," or in other words, by those who are unwilling to adopt his views in the very face of *Scripture.* But, to be sure, it should seem safer, even in spite of such insinuations as to a possible committing of the sin against the Holy Ghost, in company with Christ and His inspired apostles not to adopt such views of modern liberal theologians, than with these men to hold views in open conflict with the solemn teaching of Christ and His apostles. Let the reader judge which is the safer teaching to accept and choose whom to trust and follow.

Another Scripture cited in proof of their contention for a future probation is 1 Peter 3:18-20: "Christ also . . . made alive in the spirit; in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, that aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved through water." Very few exegetes of first rank have, however, held that this was a preaching of the *Gospel* unto *salvation.* The word translated *preach* being a form of *kerusso,* to *herald or proclaim,* not of *euaggelizo,* to evangelize or preach the Gospel, any interpretation as to the preaching of the *Gospel*

of salvation is untenable. Some, like Calvin, have held that it consisted in the *announcement of salvation* to the spirits of the *just.* Others have held that this announcement included also that of *damnation* to the *unjust.* At the most, it was undoubtedly a declaration or proclamation of the Gospel to the condemned in confirmation of their punishment as being just in accordance with their life and attitude while in this world of grace.

It is apparent that Christ did go to the place of departed spirits, and that He appeared in the abode of the unrighteous, as well as in that of the righteous. But this was, without doubt, as is evident from the above text and from the analogy of Scripture, to proclaim His victory, as is indicated by the word *kerusso.*

That Christ went to the place of the *righteous,* probably immediately after His death, is shown by His word to the thief on the cross, "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43). And to contend, as is done by some, and notably was done by "Pastor" Russell, that the word *to-day* refers to the time when Christ spoke instead of the time when the thief was to be with Him in Paradise (thus placing the comma after today instead of before it), is so manifestly absurd as to need no argument here to disprove it. In this way Scripture could be made to teach almost anything, as indeed it has been made to do by many false teachers.

That Christ went to the place of the *condemned,* is most clearly shown in 1 Peter 3:18-20, already quoted —to proclaim His victory over death, etc. The spirits in prison in this passage were disobedient men when Noah pleaded with them and preached unto them and they were reserved unto the day of judgment to be

punished; and that day had, of course, not yet come. They may be said indeed to have received the Gospel from Noah's pleadings and warnings. But the contention of these men is that in 1 Peter 4:6, a form of the word *euaggelizo* is used and is translated *preached:* "For unto this end was the gospel preached even unto the dead, that they might be judged indeed according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." But they fail to see that this no doubt refers to such preaching of the Gospel to them while in this world during "the day of salvation" (2 Cor. 6:2), and therefore does not likely refer to any preaching by Christ Himself, as in 1 Peter 3:18-20. At any rate, all attempts to read into this passage the idea of a possible offer of salvation beyond this life would be against the whole tenor of Scripture elsewhere.

It should, moreover, emphatically be said that, upon these men's own interpretation of 1 Peter 3:18-20 and 4:6, these passages would not constitute any proof for a *general* future probation. All that they would thus show would be that Christ, probably in His disembodied state between His death and resurrection, preached to those who had died unsaved before the *flood* or before His *advent.* It would then only show that God in Christ specially and extraordinarily interposed on behalf of those who had lived *before His incarnation* and had not received, or could not have received, the blessings of His atonement. But it would prove nothing as to a future probation for those dying *after the Saviour's advent,* and all the more certainly not for those dying *wilfully impenitent.* Indeed—and, of course, upon their own interpretation of these passages—the very concrete and definite statements therein given, as of this particular extraordinary case,

would be proof positive that they were not meant to teach any *universal* future probation for the lost. Therefore, even this argument of exponents of future probation has no validity.

Another passage of Scripture cited in proof of the theory of future probation, is 1 Cor. 15:22: "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." This passage is, however, not at all applicable in such a contention. To do so is clearly to wrest it from its context for the sake of argument. When it is read in the light of the context, the word *all* clearly means *all the saved,* or *all that are in Christ.* But should any of these men still refuse to accept this very manifest meaning and make the *all* absolutely unlimited, even then it would not be an argument for them, as it is true that even the wicked are also made alive by the power of Christ, but to a life, or an existence, of punishment. This existence, in being a forfeiture of a life of blessedness, is called the second death, etc. (Rev. 2:11; 20:6; 21:8).

These men also point to other passages, such as Matthew 10:32; 11:21-24; Romans 5:17-21. But these passages could easily be shown to be irrelevant.

It should also be said that the same arguments that are usually used in an attempt to prove the possibility of salvation to the lost after death, could with equal force be used to prove the possibility of a *future damnation* of the *saved.* Indeed, a possible future salvation would imply a possible future fall, as could readily be shown.

2 THIS THEORY DIRECTLY DISPROVED BY SCRIPTURE

The Word of God emphatically teaches that a man's condition *hereafter* depends upon his attitude toward

Christ and his conduct *here.* It is expressly so declared by our Lord in His account of the last judgment (Matt. 25:31-46), as well in many other places. How explicit the account of the rich man and Lazarus on this point! The rich man's state followed upon his conduct on earth, and it was fixed, nor was there for him any other probation. And even for his five brethren upon earth there was held out no other hope, nor any other means or opportunity of salvation, than such as the rich man himself had. And both the rich man and his brethren are represented as having had sufficient light on earth (Luke 16:19-31). See also Romans 2:5-16; Galatians 6:8; 2 Timothy 4:7-8; Hebrews 12:1.

Thus in the above it is clearly implied that death here ends the day of grace and the possibility of salvation. And even if it were conceded that in the case of those spoken of in 1 Peter 3:18-20 we have an exception, then surely it would be *only an exception;* and as an exception it would not in the least set aside the rule, but rather only prove the rule, as we have shown. But, to be sure, we are far from accepting such an interpretation of these passages.

We shall now endeavor somewhat fully to show that Scripture, not only by implication, but also *directly,* teaches that death here ends the day of grace. This is *implied* in many Old Testament warnings, as already noted (Chapter I); and in other places it is also more or less clearly *stated.* Thus, when Isaiah said, "Seek ye Jehovah while he may be found" (Isa. 55:6), he clearly implied also a time when He may not be found. See also Psalm 88:11; 95:7; Ecclesiastes 11:3. Indeed, in the Old Testament this seems rather to be assumed or taken for granted. But what is

taught only in dim outline in the Old Testament, is very clearly stated in the fuller and completer revelation of the New Testament.

Christ emphatically taught that there is no other probation, but that a person's destiny is fixed at death; and this point bears repeating and developing. In the parable of the ten virgins we read, "Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. Watch therefore, for ye know not the day nor the hour." (Matt. 25:11-13). The same is also taught in Luke 13:25-28: "When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, open to us; and he shall answer and say to you, I know you not whence ye are," etc. And again, in Luke 16:26 we have these explicit words: "Between us and you [the rich man] there is a great gulf fixed, so that they that would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us." And very clearly is this implied in the words that Christ put upon the lips of the rich man in *Hades,* as already intimated, when he requested that Lazarus, or one from the dead, be sent to his father's house to warn his five brethren before they died and their destiny would be fixed, "that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment" (Luke 16:27-30). Nor was the answer, as given in the next verse, less explicit: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead."

In answering the attack of the Pharisees in the eighth chapter of St. John, the Saviour said, "I go away, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sin:

whither I go, ye cannot come . . . I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins" (John 8:21-24). See also Luke 12:20-31; John 7:34; 9:4; 12:35-36. In the Lord's solemn warning to be prepared for His second coming for the resurrection and final judgment, He is equally emphatic that after the resurrection and judgment there will be no probation. See Matthew 24:42-51; Luke 21:34-36. And, of course, in the Master's account of the judgment itself, it is so plainly taught that after that there will be no probation, as to shut off all further argument against this teaching of Scripture (Matt. 25:31-46). The words of verses 41 and 46 should be final, "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life." For an explanation of this passage in answer to those who would try to explain away the word *eternal,* see Chapter VII.

The apostles also taught that death here ends the day of grace. This is clearly stated by St. Paul in 2 Corinthians 6:2, already quoted. In Hebrews 9:27 we are distinctly told that "it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this cometh judgment." Thus death is said to terminate probation and man's state *then* to determine judgment and destiny. This is also unmistakably taught in Hebrews 3:7-19, where the fate of the rebellious Hebrews, who were not permitted to enter Canaan but died in the wilderness, is held up as a warning to those on the way to the heavenly Canaan, against "an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God." Of similar import is Hebrews 4:7, "He again defineth a certain day, To-day,

saying in David, . . . To-day if ye shall hear his voice, Harden not your hearts." And equally clear is Hebrews 10:26-31: "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

That the apostles were firm in this conviction that death ends the day of grace, is shown not only in their inspired writings, but also by their otherwise inexplicable zeal for the salvation of men. They unquestionably regarded their preaching as the only chance for the salvation of those whom they addressed. So, indeed, all missionary zeal would be practically meaningless if there were another probation.

Nor is the book of Revelation without its testimony on this point. The following solemn words should be conclusive evidence against any future probation: "He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still: and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him do righteousness still: and he that is holy, let him be made holy still. Behold,

I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give to each man according as his work is" (Rev. 22:11-12). The same is also clearly taught in other passages.

Moreover, it should be stated that this interpretation of these passages is in accord with the consensus of almost universal Christendom in all ages. And no one who at all believes in the Spirit's guidance, should attempt lightly to set aside such overwhelming testimony.

The state of a person at death, therefore, forever determines his future condition, either of blessedness or of misery, with the possibility only of growing more and more in such condition, as we shall now proceed to show.

3 EVIDENCE FROM THE ELEMENT OF FIXEDNESS IN CHARACTER

There is another element that these exponents of the theory of probationism overlook or set aside, and that is the development and tendency toward a final fixedness of character.

When a tendency toward evil begins to develop, it may be said to increase as by moral gravitation; and only by some external force, yea, the very power of God, can it be arrested in its course. Who does not know the power of habit! When sinful habits are developed so as to dominate the will, then the course is downward, and that, in some instances, almost with uniform acceleration. If only individual acts of evil and sin were involved, it would not be so hard for the sinner to reform. But it is *sinfulness,* or a sinful character as developed by continual sinning, that enslaves him. Sinfulness breeds acts of sin, and acts of sin develop sinfulness. Having surrendered to the

power of evil and closed the heart to the Spirit's pleadings, the sinner goes on sinning in his downward course, his character growing more and more hardened and perverse. This tendency to sin, in the accumulating sinful development of character, would make even the *wisdom* and *practicability* of a second probation questionable. May not this be one of the elements in the very reason why punishment *must* be eternal?

Thus future punishment becomes an inherent necessity from the nature of sin or sinfulness, as well as the result of a sentence for sins committed and for the rejection of grace. It therefore depends upon what the person *is* or has *become,* as well as upon what he *has done* or *omitted to do.* The sinner's nature has thus become such as even to *unfit* him for associations of blessedness.

Having seen that the theory of *probationism* is untenable as an article of faith, we shall now proceed to consider a theory that is held by over half of nominal Christendom; namely, the theory of *purgationism.*

CHAPTER V

PURGATIONISM

IS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY TENABLE?

According to one of the cardinal doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church (and, in a modified form, of the Greek Catholic Church), the souls of those who die penitent, or in a state of grace, must nevertheless suffer for a time hereafter for the sins for which they did not make satisfaction here.

I AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

In order to present the doctrine all the more correctly and without fear of even the appearance of misrepresentation, we shall allow Rome to speak for herself.

1 AS GIVEN IN EARLIER OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

As the doctrine of purgatory was not attacked during the middle ages by any party or person of great influence, and as a somewhat general idea as to its essential elements was current, no official statement was given by the Roman Catholic Church until the year 1439, when such seemed necessary in her efforts of reunion with the Greek Catholic Church.

The principal official statements of this doctrine were made by the Councils of Ferrara-Florence (1438-

1439) and Trent (1545-1563). The statement given at Florence is as follows: "Likewise if true penitents depart in the charity of God, before they have made satisfaction for their sins, of commission and omission, by worthy fruits of repentance, their souls are cleansed by purgatorial fires after death, and that they may be relieved from their pains, the suffrages of the faithful, who are alive, are of advantage to them, that is, sacrifices of masses, prayers, and alms, and other offices of piety, which are accustomed to be done by the faithful for other faithful according to the custom of the Church" (Kinane: *Purgatory,* p. 36).

Canon XXX, Subjoined to Chapter xvi, Sixth Session (Jan., 1547) of the *Council of Trent,* is as follows: "If any man saith, that, after the grace of justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted, and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world, or in the next in Purgatory, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be opened [to him]: let him be anathema." At its Twenty-fifth and last Session (Dec. 3-4, 1563) the decree of Trent to *perpetuate* the doctrine was as follows: "Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the Sacred Writings and the ancient traditions of the Fathers, taught in sacred Councils, and very recently (Sixth Session, as above) in this oecumenical Synod, that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar—the holy Synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavour that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, transmitted by the holy Fath-

ers and sacred Councils, be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ. But let the more difficult and subtle questions, and which tend not to edification, and from which for the most part there is no increase of piety, be excluded from popular discourses before the uneducated multitude. In like manner, such things as are uncertain, or which labor under an appearance of error, let them not allow to be made public and treated of."

Such were the statement of *Florence* and the canon and decree of *Trent* concerning purgatory, but the details of the doctrine were not clearly or fully stated or defined by these great Councils. According to the decree of *Trent,* what was "transmitted by the holy Fathers and sacred Councils" was to "be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ," as that doctrine. And as many details in the writings of certain earlier theologians had been thus transmitted, there was a general understanding in the Church as to the chief elements of this doctrine, which, therefore, constituted the accepted teaching on the subject. But "the more difficult and subtle questions" and "such things as are uncertain, or which labor under an appearance of error," were judiciously to be avoided.

The fresh demands of later generations for more definite statements were, however, met from time to time. And the fullest, and generally considered the best, statement of this doctrine was made by Bellarmine (d. 1621) in his work entitled *De Purgatorio.* In this book the author, from a strictly Roman Catholic standpoint, enters upon a very elaborate defense of the doctrine by citations from the Fathers, the de-

crees of the councils, and some from the Scriptures, and by appealing to general tradition and reason in further proof of his contentions. He even localizes purgatory, as follows: "Theologians are almost unanimous in teaching that Purgatory, at least the ordinary place of expiation, is situated in the interior of the earth" (Kinane: *Purgatory,* p. 47). He also writes, "There is no doubt that the pains of Purgatory are not limited to ten or twenty years, and that they last in some cases for centuries" (*Ibid.,* p. 65).

2 AS GIVEN IN LATER APPROVED WORKS

We shall now proceed to give a few somewhat recent statements on this subject. The *Catechism of Perseverance* gives this definition: "Purgatory is a place or state of being in which the souls of the just, who have departed this life without fully satisfying the divine justice for their sins, are finally purified before being admitted into heaven. . . . We are to believe: 1st, that there is such a place; 2d, that souls suffer there; 3d, that the holy sacrifice of the mass, the prayers and good works of the living, will help them" (p. 176).

Another definition is as follows: "Purgatory is a place where the souls of those must suffer for a time, who, though dying without grave sin on their souls, have not done complete penance for their offenses against God. . . . The holy souls suffer in purgatory to expiate either their venial sins, or those mortal sins, which, though absolved, have not been completely atoned for" (Spirago-Clarke: *The Catechism Explained,* p. 264).

A still fuller definition is the following: "Those

who depart this life in a state of grace are not always fit to enter at once into the Beatific Vision. They may be burdened with venial sin; or, though entirely free from any kind of sin, they may still have not fully paid the debt of temporal punishment due for their forgiven sins. Such souls must be cleansed from their sins, or must undergo this temporal punishment. The abode or condition in which this takes place, is what is meant by Purgatory. It is therefore a sort of middle state between Heaven and Hell; but the souls who are there are really saved, and will infallibly enter Heaven as soon as they are fitted for that happy consummation. They can no longer merit or sin; they cannot properly satisfy God by meriting—they can only make some sort of satisfaction by suffering. On the other hand, the faithful who are still on earth can help them by their prayers and good works, and for this purpose nothing is so efficacious as the Mass" (Wilhelm and Scannell: *Manual of Catholic Theology*, Vol. II, p. 553).

In his popular work, specially addressed to non-Catholics and often effectively used among them, Cardinal Gibbons says: "The Catholic Church teaches that, besides a place of eternal torments for the wicked and of everlasting rest for the righteous, there exists in the next life a middle state of temporal punishment, allotted for those who have not satisfied the justice of God for sins already forgiven. She also teaches us that, although the souls consigned to this intermediate state, commonly called purgatory, cannot help themselves, they may be aided by the suffrages of the faithful on earth" *(Faith of Our Fathers,* p. 247).

We shall add one more definition, and that a very recent one: "Purgatory . . . in accordance with

Catholic teaching is a place or condition of temporal punishment for those who, departing this life in God's grace, are not entirely free from venial faults, or have not fully paid the satisfaction due to their transgressions" (*Catholic Encyclopaedia,* Vol. XII, p. 575). And after referring the reader to several passages in the decisions of *Trent,* this article proceeds, "Further than this the definitions of the Church do not go, but the tradition of the Fathers and the Schoolmen must be consulted to explain the teachings of the councils, and to make clear the belief and the practices of the Faithful" *(Ibid.).*

Such is the doctrine of purgatory as held by the Roman Catholic Church in the middle ages, as well as in the twentieth century, nor has the doctrine undergone any essential changes since its first promulgation. How and when, then, did this doctrine originate and develop into its present form? As an understanding of its origin and development enables us better to estimate Rome's defense of this doctrine and throws light upon, and adds weight to, our answer to it, we shall give an outline of its history.

I BRIEF HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE

As a non-Christian theory the idea of a purgatory antedates the Christian era. The heathen people of Central Asia believed in some such fire of purgation long before the birth of Christ. So the Jews, in their period of degeneracy between the two Testaments, apparently entertained such an idea, as seems to be implied in 2 Maccabees 12:40, etc. Among the Greeks, Plato (427-347 B. C.) believed in some purgatorial process in Lake Acherusia, after undergoing which the soul might rise again to the upper air.

As an ecclesiastical doctrine its germs appeared early in the history of the Church, and these were apparently suggested by heathen and Jewish conceptions. Tertullian (fl. 200) already implied some such intermediate place or state in his contention that the living should pray and make sacrificial oblations for the dead. Clement of Alexandria (fl. 200) speaks of some spiritual fire, at least in this world. Origen (d. 254) went a step farther in teaching that, while this purifying fire was indeed spiritual, all without exception must pass through it. That the speculative belief in some such fire of purification beyond the grave was held by many already in the fourth century, may be inferred from various statements or exhortations about prayers, etc., for the dead, in the writings of Eusebius (d. 340), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), Ambrose (d. 397), and several other Fathers. The great Augustine (d. 430), following in the footsteps of his predecessors, also considered such purgatorial fire *(ignis purgatorius)* not improbable as following an earthly *ignis tribulationis,* and thought its reality might be implied in such passages as Matthew 12:31-32 and 1 Corinthians 3:13-15. In these early speculations, however, it was only a spiritual burning that was meant, without the gross material ideas of a later period.

The doctrine of purgatory as a tenet of the Western Church was not developed until the time of Gregory the Great (d. 604). Then during the next six centuries very few elements were added to, or but little light was thrown upon, this doctrine. In the speculative teachings of Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), Bonaventura (d. 1274), Gerson (d. 1429), and others of their age, the doctrine was more clearly defined and such details

as the alleged materiality of its fire were definitely taught. Then at the *Council of Ferrara-Florence* (1438-1439) it was officially but only partially stated or restated, in its fruitless attempt to unite the Eastern and Western Churches. And this statement was in part made the basis of the action of the *Council of Trent* (1545-1563), where this doctrine, tacitly accepted, was endorsed and ordered to be promulgated. Its fullest development, however, as already noted, was reached in Bellarmine's *De Purgatorio,* which is the chief fountain and inspiration for the many later defenses of this doctrine.

Such in brief is the history of this doctrine, showing that its ultimate source is traceable to heathenism and degenerate Judaism, and that its development, which was a gradual one, was the result of philosophico-theological speculations, until it became a universal tradition and the accepted doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

III ROME'S DIRECT PROOFS FOR THE DOCTRINE AND OUR ANSWER

The doctrine of purgatory is so essential to the Roman theological and ecclesiastical system, and it is so closely related to and bound up with other associated doctrines, that it has called forth many a defense from the time of the Reformation, when it was so mightily attacked by Luther and other Reformers, even to our own day. And Rome's arguments in defense of the doctrine have always been virtually the same.

The chief proofs are very briefly stated in the words of the Roman *Catechism of Perseverance,* pages 178-179: "We have many proofs of the existence of purgatory. The first is drawn from the Old Testament.

It is written that Judas Machabeus sent to Jerusalem a sum of money to have prayers said for the souls of those who had fallen in battle, that they might be delivered from their sins. *For,* adds the Scripture, *it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead.* . . . The second proof of purgatory is taken from the New Testament. Our Lord says in the gospel, *He that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come.* There are, therefore, sins forgiven in the next world, in a place which is neither heaven nor hell, and which we call purgatory. . . The third proof of purgatory is the tradition of the Catholic Church. From the time of the apostles the Church has not ceased to pray and to offer up the holy sacrifice for deceased children. Tertullian, St. Justin, St. Augustine, and all the other fathers of the Church, testify to this usage, and assure us that it was derived from the apostles, and, consequently, from our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . The fourth proof of purgatory is the tradition of the ancient sects separated from the Church. These sects, spread throughout the East, still preserve the custom of praying for the dead. They have not borrowed it from the Church since their separation; they received it, therefore, from the apostles, and consequently from our Lord. . . . The fifth proof of purgatory is the tradition of the pagans themselves. We see in their history that they offered sacrifices for the dead, and that they prayed for them. This usage is found even among savage nations."

It is seen that these so-called proofs are simply assertions. They thus constitute really no proof, but are only so many assumptions. Let the reader very carefully note that Rome's method of proof is mainly to

appeal to herself, either in tradition or in her misinterpretation and misapplication of certain Scripture passages, for the enforcing of her theories, together with such theories and practices of schismatics and heathen as have been similar to her own. She is thus trying to weigh herself in her doctrines while holding her own scale, instead of trying to weigh herself while resting that scale upon the solid rock of Holy Scripture. Then, too, her supposed proofs from her own traditions and those of the ancient sects, that the doctrine of purgatory and its associated doctrines are traceable to the apostles, are statements that are historically untrue. And in citing heathen tradition and practices in proof of her claims, Rome is not helping, but greatly hindering, her cause, as some of her theories and practices are only too easily traceable to heathen or non-Christian sources. But perhaps more of this later.

Moreover, these statements or assumptions in proof of purgatory, like all the rest of Rome's teachings, the faithful are expected to accept as final upon the authority of the supposedly infallible Church. It is, however, true that in the writings of some of Rome's apologists an attempt is made to *defend* these statements in proof of this doctrine; but it is at best only an *attempt*, as we shall see.

Cardinal Gibbons somewhat at length defends this doctrine by a development of the proofs generally adduced *(Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 247 *sq.)*. And his attempted proofs and explanations may seem quite plausible to the faithful of his own communion, who have been taught implicitly to accept the teachings of their Church, without examining them in the light of Holy Scripture. They may even deceive some unwary

Protestants, especially those who are driven about by every wind of doctrine. But to the unbiassed investigator of truth, the Cardinal's arguments utterly fail to bring conviction. Indeed, in his attempted proofs of the existence of purgatory it is really not the doctrine of purgatory that he is seen laboring to establish, but the equally unscriptural doctrine of prayers for the dead as indirectly implying or necessitating a purgatory. Thus, as an argument for *purgatory,* he contends that the doctrine of *prayers for the dead* is "plainly contained in the Old Testament" (*Ibid.* p. 248). This is the first proof given in the *Catechism of Perseverance,* cited above. But this so-called Old Testament proof is not based upon the Old Testament at all, but upon a passage in one of the non-canonical or apocryphal books; namely, 2 Maccabees (12:43-46).

The Cardinal's contention that the doctrine is taught, or at least "insinuated" in the New Testament, is, of course, based chiefly upon Matthew 12:32, "Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in that which is to come." This is the second proof given in the *Catechism of Perseverance.* This passage, however, is plainly altogether foreign to the question, nor is its interpretation by the Roman Church at all tenable in the light of many other passages, as we have seen under *Probationism.* Moreover, even at her own interpretation, it would be out of harmony with Rome's teaching concerning purgatory. The Roman Church holds that the temporal punishment in purgatory is primarily for sins *forgiven in this life* but for which full satisfaction has not been made. This would not fit into her interpretation of

this passage, as referring to a *possible forgiveness hereafter.* This passage has thus no weight as an argument in proof of the existence of a purgatory, which not only is not taught elsewhere in Scripture, but which is even contrary to the whole tenor of its teaching.

In this connection we shall quote another Roman Catholic authority upon Matthew 12:32. After citing this passage to prove the existence of purgatory, Kinane says: "This text is a strong proof in favor of purgatory. Sin cannot enter Heaven; therefore there is no forgiveness there. Out of hell there is no pardon or redemption. Therefore there must be a third place called Purgatory, where sins—we mean venial sins—and the punishment due to mortal sins, are forgiven and remitted" (Purgatory, p. 17).

How absurd for Rome to invent a new division (as Rome invents two others for similar reasons) in the future world in order to explain away a passage of Scripture that does not fit into her theological system! Well, it is about as absurd as, conversely, to quote the passage of Scripture in proof of an invention of mere theological speculation.

Coming back to Cardinal Gibbon's arguments, he also quotes 1 Corinthians 3:13-15; but this is not at all germane to the doctrine he attempts to defend. It would seem almost that the Cardinal felt that this passage does not apply, for he says, "This interpretation is not mine. It is the unanimous voice of the Fathers of Christendom" (*Faith of Our Fathers,* p. 250). Indeed, of this passage the Catholic Encyclopaedia very apologetically says, "While this passage presents considerable difficulty, it is regarded by many of the Fathers and theologians as evidence for the existence

of an intermediate state in which the dross of lighter transgressions will be burnt away, and the souls thus purified will be saved" (Vol. XII, pp. 576-577).

Such is Rome's reason for using this passage in proof of the doctrine of purgatory; namely, because many of the Fathers and theologians have so applied it. If the fact that, whenever some of the Fathers—much as we honor them—or of Rome's later theologians, have applied a passage of Scripture to some doctrine or favorite theory, were elevated to the dignity of a canon of interpretation, then all the heresies of the Christian centuries could be established and vindicated. Yet Rome does that very thing when it helps *Rome's cause* and her traditional doctrines. What an exegesis to read into this passage the idea of a future purgatorial fire, such as Rome teaches! Simply to call attention to the passage with Rome's misinterpretation, is sufficient to show such exegesis to be well nigh ridiculous.

The Cardinal, as a further argument for purgatory, then proceeds to defend the doctrine of prayers for the dead by quotations from the Church Fathers, citing Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose and others *(Faith of our Fathers,* pp. 251 sq.). This is an elaboration of the third proof given in the *Catechism of Perseverance.* But the Cardinal's quotations from these men, however good and well-meaning, instead of establishing this doctrine which is so in conflict with Scripture, only prove how much these men were influenced in some of their ideas by certain tenets of heathenism out of which they had risen, and by certain Jewish beliefs in the period of spiritual apostasy and decline.

And what is true of the Cardinal's argument for

purgatory from the Fathers of the Church, is equally true of his argument from the *Liturgies of the Church (Ibid.* pp. 255 *sq.)*. The fact that the Roman Liturgies contain certain prayers for the dead, shows that, in so far at least, these originated not from Scripture, but from tradition, or from heathenism and degenerate Judaism. Moreover, to call some of these Liturgies *apostolic,* as Rome does, under the pretense that one of them was supposedly compiled by St. James, another by St. Peter, etc., is so utterly unhistoric as hardly to need any proof to the contrary. It is well known (and this Rome's historians must acknowledge) that the origin of these Liturgies is of a much later date than that of the apostles. They were developed during the time when many of the errors had already crept in, which Rome, in rather placing tradition on a level with, or even in the practice above, Scripture, still cherishes.

What then does the Cardinal's argument from Jewish practice of praying for the dead amount to in the light of what we have said, especially in the light of *Scripture* to the contrary? Is the uninspired apocryphal book of Maccabees, not to speak of other sources, to be exalted above the genuine and authentic books of the Bible, especially those of the New Testament, so thoroughly proved to be inspired and therefore canonical? Shall the inspired Word of God be judged or weighed by Roman tradition and Jewish practice, or shall Jewish practice and Roman tradition be weighed or judged by the unerring Word of God and authentic history? Are the teachings of prophets, and of Christ and His apostles, to be determined by Roman decrees and papal bulls; or, are the truths and errors of papal bulls and Roman decrees to be determined by the ex-

plicit declarations of inspired prophets or of Christ and His blessed apostles, as recorded in the Bible? To ask these questions is to answer them!

To the above supposed proofs we shall add several rather speculative arguments. The *Catholic Encyclopaedia,* Vol. XII, calls attention to the fact that the *Council of Trent* (Session XIV, Canon XI) "reminds the faithful that God does not always remit the whole punishment due to sin together with the guilt, God requires satisfaction, and will punish sin, and this doctrine involves as its necessary consequence a belief that the sinner failing to do penance in this life may be punished in another world, and so not to be cast off eternally from God" (p. 575). Again, "For unrepented venial faults, for the payment of temporal punishment due to sin at time of death, the Church has always taught the doctrine of purgatory. . . The Catholic doctrine of purgatory supposes the fact . . . that the temporal penalty due to sin is at times not wholly paid in this life. The proofs for the Catholic position, both in Scripture and in Tradition, are bound up with the practice of praying for the dead. For why pray for the dead if there be no belief in the power of prayer to afford solace to those who as yet are excluded from the sight of God? So true is this position that prayers for the dead and the existence of a place of purgation are mentioned in conjunction in the oldest passages of the Fathers who allege reasons for succouring departed souls" *(Ibid.,* pp. 575-576). And again, "In the Sacrament of Penance, guilt of sins is removed, and with it the eternal punishment due to mortal sin; but there still remains the temporal punishment required by Divine justice, and this requirement must be fulfilled either in the present life or in

the world to come, i. e., in purgatory" (Vol. VII, p. 783).

Cardinal Wiseman holds that the doctrine of purgatory "follows, as a consequence or corollary from that . . . just treated (satisfactions); so much so that the Catholic doctrine of satisfactions would be incomplete without it." He continues, "The idea that God requires satisfaction, and will punish sin, would not go to its furthest and necessary consequence, if we did not believe that the sinner may be so punished in another world, as not to be wholly and eternally cast away from God" (*Lectures,* p. 381).

Another alleged proof for its existence is given thus: "The existence of Purgatory is also a consequence of two recognized theological principles. The first of these is the distinction between mortal and venial sin; the other is the distinction between the guilt of mortal sin and the temporal punishment due even after the guilt has been forgiven. As we have already pointed out at the beginning of this section, persons dying with venial sin on their souls, or who have not fully paid their debt of temporal punishment, cannot at once enter Heaven, and yet do not deserve Hell. Indeed it is difficult to reconcile the holiness and mercy and justice of God without maintaining a place of purgation after death" (Wilhelm and Scannell: *Manual of Catholic Theology,* Vol. II, p. 559).

The above are, however, only speculative arguments and in their final analysis amount to nothing but mere assumptions. Where is Rome's authority for saying that "God does not always remit the whole punishment due to sin together with the guilt," and that He, therefore, "requires satisfaction," etc.? Where is Rome's authority for saying that, after the guilt of sin is re-

moved, "there still remains the temporal punishment required by divine justice and this requirement must be fulfilled either in the present life or in purgatory"? Or where is her authority for holding that the removing of the guilt of sin removes only the eternal punishment due to mortal sin? Indeed, whence the arbitrary distinction between venial and mortal sins? A sample of her only answer can be seen in this inadvertent concession, "The Catholic doctrine of purgatory *supposes* the fact . . . that the temporal penalty due to sin is at times not wholly paid in this life."

In several statements quoted above the practice of praying for the dead is given as a proof of the existence of purgatory. The same is done by Wilhelm and Scannell in the following words: "Before proceeding to the proof of the doctrine defined by the Council, we observe that the two points hang very much together; prayer for the dead implying that the souls could benefit thereby, and so implying the existence of a middle and temporary state" *(Manual of Catholic Theology,* Vol. II, 554). Many other writers might be cited as doing the same. In other places the doctrine of the existence of purgatory is just as emphatically cited in proof of the doctrine of prayers for the dead. This is done by Wiseman in his *Lectures,* pages 382-383, as well as by other writers.

This, truly, is reasoning in a circle; and, what is worse, at whatever point in the circle the reasoning is regarded as beginning, it must necessarily begin with an assumption, or an unproved, and indeed an easily disproved, premise. Thus Rome's doctrinal system, in its last analysis, must be regarded as self-interpreting, so that one dogma is interpreted by another, which in turn is interpreted by that dogma; or, that its various

elements must be interpreted by a certain doctrinal analogy that receives its standard from the supposedly infallible Church or her equally infallible head! At that, we suppose, we shall have to leave this argument for a while and let the reader meanwhile judge of that infallibility in the light of the contradictory history of the Roman Catholic Church with her fallible and erring Councils and popes. With the decision on this point of infallibility, her speculative unscriptural doctrines must, therefore, necessarily fall.

Among other arguments in defense of the doctrine of purgatory, we note the following: "The doctrine of purgatory follows as a postulate of reason from other teachings which Christians hold as undoubtedly true. Thus it is true that nothing imperfect shall enter heaven" (Martin: *Catholic Religion,* p. 282). For this last statement the passage of Scripture cited is Revelation 21:27: "And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they that are written in the Lamb's book of life."

It is indeed true that nothing imperfect can enter heaven; but where in this passage is the proof for the doctrine of *Purgatory*—to purge away this imperfection—especially when read in the light of the atoning merits of Jesus Christ? The natural man, or the unpardoned sinner, can indeed not of himself, or upon his own merits, enter heaven. All men are not only imperfect, but *sinners,* before God (1 John 1:8, 10). But by the grace of God, being penitent, a person can be *absolved* from all his sins. And thus, after the blood of Jesus Christ has cleansed him from all sin (1 John 1:7, 9), he is no longer imperfect or sinful, and can therefore by Christ's grace enter heaven, and does

so without any such mechanical process of purification as has existence only in the subtle scheme of Rome's tyrannizing and subjugating theological system. What pope or ecclesiastical hierarchy can close the gates of heaven's blessedness to one to whom Christ's obedience and righteousness have been imputed (Rom. 5:18-19; *et al.*)! Here also it is emphatically true that whatsoever God in Christ has cleansed no man should call common or unclean (Acts 10:15; 11:9), a fact which even the inspired Peter had to learn.

As a further argument in defense of purgatory, Martin says: "The doctrine of purgatory commends itself to the Christian reason and the human heart. It gives consolation to the mourner and encouragement to the repentant sinner. It affords occasion of exercising charity to the departed, of repairing the ingratitude of thoughtless days, of strengthening the bond of love that even death cannot break" (*Catholic Religion*, p. 288).

In these words of Martin the reader can readily discern the veiled but real reasons for the establishment of this dogma for the spiritual enslavement of Rome's mighty hosts. Let him carefully weigh every sentence in connection with what is said here, and elsewhere, on this subject. Martin's words may, to the unsuspecting reader, appeal as rhetoric, but not as logic. Any religious doctrine, whatsoever it may be, that does not rest for its foundation upon the inspired writers of Holy Scripture, is not only unsafe, but absolutely untenable, as an article of faith, however it may "commend itself to the Christian reason and the human heart," and do all the rest claimed for it by priest, cardinal, ecclesiastical Council, or even the *ex cathedra ipse dixits* of a pope.

Thus the departed are said to suffer temporal punishment "for sins already forgiven, which is not only contrary to the Gospel, but also a plain contradiction. Upon what grounds could punishment be demanded for a sin that has already been forgiven? To this Rome answers by using her scholastic invention of the distinction in sin between the guilt and the punishment (*Decrees of Trent,* especially emphasized in Darras' *General History of the Church,* p. 46). Of course, this is a necessary distinction to bolster up the doctrine of purgatory, and, in so far, goes beyond the apostles of our Lord; for they knew nothing about it, as they knew nothing about the ecclesiastical invention of purgatory, indulgences, prayers for the dead, and other related doctrines of later invention!

Martin's language at another place, in speaking of "the souls of the just, who have departed this life without fully satisfying the divine justice for their sins," is, to say the least, self-contradictory. How absurd to say that the just must yet satisfy divine justice! and yet, so does blind adherence to the arrogant teachings of Rome and her almost blasphemous claims make otherwise good and well-meaning men play fast and loose with both truth and language.

In passing, we should here state another argument that is sometimes advanced in defense of the doctrine of purgatory. This we shall give in the words of Kinane, as follows: "It is of the highest importance to bear in mind that our Blessed Lord invariably corrected in the gospel any false doctrine or errors that crept in among the Jews. Now it is evident from the Second Book of Machabees, . . . that the Jews believed in a middle state. Our Divine Lord did not condemn it as He would have done, were it false doctrine. On

the other hand he confirmed it" (*Purgatory*, p. 20). It is indeed true that our Lord did correct errors in Jewish belief; but this He generally did by His own *positive* teachings, which were to serve as such correction, rather than by negative attacks upon false beliefs. And this is very manifestly true as to the apparent Jewish belief in an intermediate state of punishment, as is seen in many passages, such as Luke 16:19-31.

From the above it is apparent that the doctrine of purgatory, not at present to speak of that of prayers for the dead and other related doctrines, is not based upon the Word of God but upon the words and opinions of men; and the truly initiated Roman Catholic must know, and should acknowledge, this. Indeed, in the very climax of Cardinal Gibbon's argument, after citing Revelation 21:27, he virtually does acknowledge this, in saying, "Therefore, your common sense demands a middle place of expiation for the purgation of the soul before it is worthy of enjoying the companionship of God and His saints" (*Faith of Our Fathers*, p. 261). And very plainly does Cardinal Wiseman acknowledge that the doctrine of purgatory is not taught in the Bible, as witness the following words: "I have more than once commented on the incorrectness of that method of arguing, which demands that we prove every one of our doctrines individually from the Scriptures. I occupied myself . . . in demonstrating the Catholic principle of faith, that the Church of Christ was instituted by Him the depository of His truths, and that, although many were recorded in His Word, still many were committed to traditional keeping, and that Christ Himself has faithfully promised to teach in His Church, and has thus secured her from error. It is on this authority that the Catholic grounds

his belief in the doctrine of Purgatory: yet, not so but that its principle is laid down, indirectly at least, in the word of God" *(Lectures,* p. 382). For Wiseman's fuller discussion on the written and unwritten Word of God, see his *Lectures,* pages 60 ff. and 304 ff. Wilhelm and Scannell make practically the same admission in the following words: "The strongest proof of the existence of Purgatory is undoubtedly to be found in tradition and the general principles of theology; but Holy Scripture is not wanting in indications that there is a place of purgation after death" (*Manual of Catholic Theology,* Vol. II, p. 554). And the following concession is made by another authority: "It is by Tradition that we know that our Lord instituted seven sacraments. It is by Tradition that we are taught that there is a purgatory. . . If therefore there is any doctrine of the Church that we do not find in Holy Scripture, we shall find it in the stream of Tradition, and shall be able to trace it up to the first ages of Christianity. The chief sources of Tradition are the writings of the Fathers, the decrees of Councils, and the creeds and prayers of the Church" (Spirago-Clarke: *The Catechism Explained,* p. 88).

It is therefore seen that Rome tries to establish her fanciful doctrine of purgatory by appealing to the apocryphal or uninspired book of 2 Maccabees, which has no place in such theological defense; to Matthew 12:32 and I Corinthians 3:13-15, which are not at all germane, as already explained; to the tradition of the Catholic Church, which she herself accumulated or invented during her paganized period of degeneracy, often only to bolster up a pet theory or doctrine that was considered necessary to complete her system of spiritual domination; and to the tradition of even the

pagans themselves, which she does not even hesitate to offer as proof for a doctrine which is not only not taught in Scripture, but which is even in direct conflict with its whole teaching of a full atonement in Christ and free salvation.

IV ROME'S ARGUMENTS FROM HER ASSOCIATED DOCTRINES EQUALLY GROUNDLESS

In order still better to understand this doctrine and the groundlessness of its defense, it must be considered *somewhat more at length* in its relation to, and development with, some other doctrines that have arisen during the centuries as partly at once the cause of its origin and its offspring. These doctrines or dogmas are directly involved in that of *purgatory;* and without these that of *purgatory* could not really be intelligently considered, because without them it would to a large extent be meaningless. We shall, therefore, briefly consider some of these related doctrines to show that they are themselves just as groundless as is that of *purgatory,* and therefore totally without weight or value as even indirect evidence in its defense.

1 HUMAN SATISFACTIONS, PENANCE, GOOD WORKS, WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION

For the sake of convenience, and because of their close relation, we shall treat the above together.

For the shortening of the punishment in purgatory the associated doctrine of *human satisfactions* was developed. Thus, though a person be forgiven the guilt of his sins, it is held that it is still necessary for him to make due *satisfaction* for the sins committed.

Cardinal Wiseman says: "We believe that upon this

forgiveness of sins, that is, after the remission of that eternal debt, which God in His justice awards to transgressions against His law, He has been pleased to reserve a certain degree of inferior or temporary punishment, appropriate to the guilt which had been incurred: and it is on this part of the punishment alone, that according to the Catholic doctrine, satisfaction can be made to God. . . . But, after all, the whole of the question necessarily rests on this consideration. Is it God's ordinance, that when in a state of grace, He still reserves the infliction of some degree of punishment for his transgressions? We say, that undoubtedly it is" (*Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church,* pp. 370-371). He then attempts to prove this contention by an appeal to the feelings or opinions of people as to the matter, and by citing certain cases of the infliction of such temporal earthly punishment in the Bible, as that of David (2 Kings 12:14), etc. But the cases cited are not at all applicable, as they are meant to illustrate God's dealing with men in this world of probation, not in the future world of fixedness in state and destiny (Chapter IV).

The above writer thus further summarizes the doctrine concerning *satisfactions:* "1. That God, after the remission of sin, retains a lesser chastisement in His power, to be inflicted on the sinner. 2. That penitential works, fasting, alms-deeds, contrite weeping, and fervent prayer, have the power of averting this punishment. 3. That this scheme of God's justice was not a part of the imperfect law, but the unvarying ordinance of His dispensation, anterior to the Mosaic ritual, and simply confirmed by Christ in the gospel. 4. That it consequently becomes a part of all true repentance to try to satisfy this divine justice, by the

voluntary assumption of such penitential works, as His revealed truth assures us have efficacy before Him" *(Ibid.,* p. 376). Again he says, "that God reserves some temporal chastisement for sin, after its guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted; and that by the voluntary performance of expiatory works, we may disarm the anger of God, and mitigate the inflictions which His justice had prepared" (*Ibid.,* p. 399).

Speaking of *penance,* in connection with satisfactions, Wiseman declares, "While these penitential observances were considered of the greatest value and importance, the Church reserved to itself the right of mitigation under various circumstances" (*Ibid.,* p. 406). He then proceeds to state these alleged circumstances.

It is thus taught that, "part of the sacrament of penance is satisfaction," and that "after the remission of the eternal punishment, there ordinarily remains a temporal punishment to be undergone, and penance is a part of it" (*Catechism of Perseverance,* p. 222). The fruits or effects of the *sacrament of penance* are, in the same connection, said to be, "1st, it remits all the sins committed after baptism; 2d, it remits the eternal punishment due to sin and sometimes even the temporal punishment; 3d, it restores the merits of good works" *(Ibid.).*

For Rome's official statement as to the *necessity* and *fruit* of *satisfactions* and *penance,* see Chapter VIII, Fourth Session of the *Council of Trent.*

According to this theory, therefore, God's forgiveness consists in remitting only the penalty of eternal death due to so-called mortal sin, together with its guilt, but some human satisfaction must yet be made for man's transgressions, especially for so-called ven-

ial sins, for the satisfying of divine justice. And if this is not made here in the form of various outward satisfactions, by penance, etc., it must be made hereafter.

According to this, therefore, the merits of Christ, instead of affording full satisfaction, may be said only to commute the otherwise eternal punishment into a temporal one; and to these merits of Christ must, therefore, be added those of man to make satisfaction complete. The merits of Christ are indeed held to be sufficient to atone for man's guilt, but they are said to take away the guilt only of original sin. Thus, for the guilt of actual sin, it is claimed, satisfaction must be made on the part of man.

Rome further teaches that certain *deeds* or *works* of man of themselves have saving spiritual merit or value before God. And, in order to sustain this theory, it is held that, "Whereas Jesus Christ Himself continually infuses his virtue into the justified . . . and this virtue always precedes and accompanies and follows, their good works, . . . we must believe that nothing further is wanting to the justified, to prevent their being accounted to have, by these very works which have been done in God, fully satisfied the divine law according to the state of this life, and to have truly merited eternal life" (*Council of Trent*, Sixth Session, Chapter XVI).

It is further held that many of the saints, in addition to being able to do what is directly commanded, or what the law prescribes as man's duty, are able to do *even more*, by performing such works as are left optional or by living up to certain rules which in themselves are not obligatory, especially such as the observing of the three monastic vows of total poverty, abso-

lute chastity and implicit obedience. Such superabundant good works are called *works of supererogation.* And by the accumulation of them on the part of many saints, it is held that a *fund* or *treasury of superabundant merits* has been formed, and that this *fund* is at the disposal of the Church through the power of the keys supposedly vested in the pope as its visible head. Thus Cardinal Wiseman says: "The Church holds that, by the communion of Saints, penitential works performed by the just, beyond what their own sins might exact, are available to other members of Christ's mystical body; that, for instance, the sufferings of the spotless Mother of God, . . . the austerities and persecutions of the baptist, . . . the tortures endured by the numberless martyrs, whose lives had been pure from vice and sin,—the prolonged rigours of holy anchorites, . . . all these made consecrated and valid through their union with the merits of Christ's passion, . . . formed a store of meritorious blessings, applicable to the satisfaction of other sinners" (*Lectures,* p. 400).

These *merits* from the *works of supererogation,* or works beyond what are necessary for the saints' own salvation, together with the superabundant merits of Christ, are said to become available for the shortening of the pains of *purgatory* for those less forunate in good works, chiefly through the Church's or the pope's power of granting *indulgences (Ibid.).* Upon this point Kinane writes: "We must bear in mind that the Church has her treasures. She has the infinite merits of our Blessed Saviour, Jesus Christ; and the superabundant merits of the blessed Virgin, and the saints. The Church dispenses these treasures by holy Indulgences . . . Indulgences remit a part, sometimes the

whole of the temporal punishment due to sin" (*Purgatory,* p. 134).

All the above noted dogmas really blend into one, and in effect amount to this; namely, that by meritorious deeds man is partly the author of his own salvation. These dogmas ascribe to human deeds a value or meritoriousness before God that is not only not sanctioned, but even repeatedly and emphatically denied in the Scriptures. Thus, to speak of *good works* as having merit before Him, to whom our best is but a natural duty, is unscriptural and unwarranted; but to speak of works of *supererogation,* or works above what is needful, is absurd. And if so-called *good works* and *works of supererogation* avail nothing before God, what becomes of *penance* which is supposed to imply, or to be involved in, such works? And with the dogma of *penance* that of *satisfactions* must necessarily fall.

Thus the apostle Paul declares to the Ephesians (2: 8-9), "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory." Again he says, "I do not make void the grace of God: for if righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for naught" (Gal. 2:21). So then we are saved by grace through faith, and in the words of St. Paul, "But if it is by grace, it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace" (Rom. 11:6). Moreover, Paul's practical exhortation to the Philippians (2:12), "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," is not at all applicable in proof of any such dogma as that of Roman Catholic work-righteousness. It is a practical exhortation for them to continue, by God's grace, that life of obedience which they had so nobly begun. And, indeed, in the

very next verse the apostle plainly says that is is God who works in them and, therefore, makes it possible.

The great Augustine epigrammatically says of good works, "We keep all the commandments of God, when all is forgiven us that we do not keep." Indeed, even at best we are but unprofitable servants, as the Lord Himself says, "When ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do" (Luke 17:10).

We believe that enough has been said to show that these dogmas, which are necessitated by (and equally necessitate) that of *purgatory* to make that dogma tolerably plausible or palatable even to Rome's devotees, are utterly groundless. Therefore, as arguments for the dogma of *purgatory,* for whose defense they have indeed largely been developed, these dogmas are utterly valueless.

2 INDULGENCES, THE POWER OF THE KEYS, CONFESSION, PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

These doctrines, or dogmas, are also very closely associated with, or involved in, that of purgatory. And as they are claimed to constitute additional indirect proof for that doctrine, they require consideration at this point. Moreover, in establishing their groundlessness, we shall further prove the doctrine of *purgatory* to be untenable as an article of faith. As these doctrines are also very closely related, we shall treat them together.

According to Cardinal Gibbons, defining *indulgences,* "An Indulgence is simply a remission in whole or in part, through the superabundant merits of Jesus Christ and His saints, of the temporal punishment due

to God on account of sin, after the guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted." (*Faith of Our Fathers,* p. 428). Again, "An Indulgence is called plenary or partial, according as it remits the whole or a part of the temporal punishment due to sin" (*Ibid.,* p. 431). In the words of Deharbe, "An Indulgence is a remission granted out of the Sacrament of Penance, of that temporal punishment which, even after the sin is forgiven, we have yet to undergo, either here in in Purgatory" (*A Complete Catechism,* p. 295). And again, the same author says, "With the sin, God always remits the eternal punishment, but He does not always remit the temporal punishment due for it. . . . It is that punishment which we have to suffer either here, or in Purgatory" (*Ibid.,* p. 292). Or, in the words of another authority, "In indulgences, . . . the Church has no reference to the inward guilt or to the weight of eternal punishment incurred by sin, but only to the temporal chastisement and its necessary expiation. When, therefore, an indulgence is said to be a remission or forgiveness of sin, the phrase applies only to the outward guilt, or that portion of the evil whereof the ancient penitential canons took cognizance" (Wiseman: *Lectures,* p. 412).

Upon the *applying of indulgences* to souls in *purgatory* we shall also have several of Rome's authorities speak for their Church. Deharbe says, "And Indulgences can also be gained for the benefit of the souls in Purgatory" (*A Complete Catechism,* p. 298). Upon this point Lepecier makes this statement: "It is a part of the Catholic doctrine, to believe that we can apply to the souls in Purgatory the Indulgences granted by the Church. . . . And as they help us by their prayers, so do we help them by our fasts, alms-deeds,

the sacrifice of the Mass, and particularly by the application of Indulgences" (*Indulgences,* pp. 49-50). Again, he says, "She [the Church] can help them *by way of suffrage,* offering, or impetration; that is, she can draw from off her own testimony the merits of Christ, and offer them to God praying Him to accept these suffrages in their behalf. And in this indirect manner, the Church helps the souls of her children that are detained in the flames of Purgatory" (*Ibid.,* p. 51). And, to quote Deharbe again, "By what means can we assist the poor souls in Purgatory? By prayers, alms-deeds, and other good works, especially by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the application of Indulgences (*A Complete Catechism,* p. 151). Of similar import are the following words: "The faithful on earth can help the holy souls in purgatory by good works; in particular by prayers, fastings, alms-deeds, by offering or being present at Mass, by receiving the sacrament and gaining indulgences" (Spirago-Clarke: *The Catechism Explained,* p. 266).

Upon the source of indulgences, in addition to what is already stated or implied in the foregoing, the *Catechism of Perseverance* says, "The source of indulgences are the superabundant merits of our Lord, of the Virgin Mary and the saints. . . . In order to gain indulgences, we must 1st, perform the works of prayers prescribed by the sovereign pontiff, according to his intention" (p. 225). And Lepecier asks and answers the following question: "When is it, then, that an Indulgence is granted? . . . When a donation or transfer is made over from the treasury of the Church by the qualified Prelate" (*Indulgences,* p. 38).

As to the *reciprocal blessings* which are supposed to come to those who secure or offer *indulgences,* etc., for

souls in *purgatory,* Kinane makes the following striking statement: "If then during life, for God's sake and God's glory, we have a merciful charity for the poor suffering souls in Purgatory; if we offer for their relief our Masses, Holy Communion, prayers, alms, and indulgences, and leave our own souls to the mercy of God, there can't be a doubt but when our day of suffering in Purgatory will come, our merciful, grateful, and kind Saviour, Jesus Christ, will inspire holy souls, whether in Heaven or on earth, to pray for us; or will Himself directly, in some mysterious way, shorten the time of our imprisonment, and cool the burning flames" (*Purgatory,* p. 185).

The *decree of the Council of Trent* concerning indulgences is as follows: "Whereas the power of conferring Indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church, and she has, even in the most ancient times, used the said power delivered unto her of God, the sacred holy Synod teaches and enjoins that the use of Indulgences, for the Christian people most salutary, and approved of by the authority of sacred Councils, is to be retained in the Church; and it condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are useless, or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them" (Twenty-fifth Session, Dec. 4, 1563).

Thus, according to the teachings of Rome, the pope, as the Vicar of Christ on earth and the supreme holder of the keys to the kingdom of heaven, also holds the keys to the treasury of *superabundant merits.* He is declared to have supreme power of dispensing these merits, through the proper intermediaries, to whom he will, and therefore to those who fulfill the conditions of the Church—or the sovereign pontiff's intention (*Catechism of Perseverance,* p. 225)—for their dis-

posal, by having prayers said for the dead, by the bloodless sacrifice of the mass, etc. The bishops, moreover, have been instructed to see to it that this doctrine is everywhere believed and proclaimed. Hence there have naturally arisen in the Church of Rome the many abuses associated with this doctrine, such as the *farming or selling of indulgences* by men like Tetzel (1516-1517), various pilgrimages, etc.

Such is Rome's teaching as to indulgences. But, as is readily seen, her teaching is a human invention that has no foundation either in Scripture or in human reason. It is totally in conflict with the very explicit teachings of Scripture concerning full and free forgiveness because of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice. Thus St. Paul writes, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). As there is thus no temporal punishment to be undergone by those who have been forgiven and justified, the very ground or reason for so-called indulgences has no existence.

Rome's contention that with forgiveness God "does not always remit the temporal punishment due for it", is simply an arbitrary assertion for which there is no foundation whatever. Rome appeals to "that portion of the evil whereof the ancient penitential canons took cognizance." Then what were those particular *ancient penitential canons,* and by what or whose authority did their simply *taking cognizance* establish what is not only not established in Scripture but what is emphatically denied? The absurdity of the whole theory of indulgences is so apparent as to be in itself conclusive evidence against it.

What, then, becomes of the theory of applying indulgences to souls in a supposed purgatory that has ab-

solutely no existence in reality? It can surely have no evidential value for the existence of such purgatory. And as to the source of indulgences, who could elevate the deeds of the Virgin Mary and the saints thus to become *merits* before God for *distribution to others?* Against this St. Paul is very emphatic: "Are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we before laid to the charge both of Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one. . . . There is none that doeth good, no, not so much as one" (Rom. 3:9-12). Again, "The scripture shut up all things under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe" (Gal. 3:22). See also Job 15:14-16; 25:4-6; Ps. 51:5.

And what shall we say of supposed reciprocal blessings, of which Kinane writes? Well, it is sufficient to say that even Kinane makes these only hypothetical. This, therefore, needs no further answer.

The *power to grant indulgences* is, of course, said to go with the *power of the keys.* Thus Cardinal Wiseman says, "What then is an indulgence? It is no more than a remission by the Church, in virtue of the keys, or the judicial authority committed to her, of a portion, or the entire, of the temporal punishment due to sin" (*Lectures,* p. 400). In the words of the *Catholic Encyclopaedia,* "The extra-sacramental remission [indulgence] of the temporal punishment due, in God's justice, to sin that has been forgiven, . . . is granted by the Church in the exercise of the power of the keys, through the application of the superabundant merits of Christ and of the saints, and for some just and reasonable motive" (Vol. VII, p. 783).

What a marvelous system of theories and arbitrary

assumptions! How did Rome come to know that she has this power to remit in whole or in part "the temporal punishment due to sin"? And whence the knowledge of supposed superfluous merits, and all the other theories? The answer may not be far to seek. These theories having been suggested, Rome found that they fitted well into her system. Then, too, they were found to be so many added links in the mighty chain which she has been almost imperceptibly and well-nigh unconsciously forging through the centuries for the religious, and even for the civil and material, subjugation of the nations. From Rome's viewpoint that must be regarded as reason enough, and her viewpoint is the only one, in her estimation, and her dicta must supposedly be absolute and final.

But what is Rome's ground for the dogma of the *power of the keys* and in whom is this power supposed to be vested? The Church holds that the *power of the keys* is vested in the pope as the successor of St. Peter. Thus one writer expresses it: "The supremacy of the pope . . . signifies nothing more than that the pope or Bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, possesses authority and jurisdiction, in things spiritual, over the entire Church, so as to constitute its visible head, and the vicegerent of Christ upon earth . . . We . . . hold the pope to be the source of authority; as all the subordinate rulers in the Church are subject to him, and receive directly, or indirectly, their jurisdiction from and by him" (Wiseman: *Lectures,* pp. 262-263). To this we shall add what another authority says upon this point as to this power in the *priests* "Every priest receives at ordination the power of the keys. . . . As, however, the exercise of this power is an act of judicial authority, it can be per-

formed only upon such subjects as are assigned to the priest. . . . The Pope has ordinary jurisdiction over all the world; the parish priests over their parishes" (Wilhelm and Scannell: *Manual of Catholic Theology,* Vol. II, pp. 481-482).

Evidence for this dogma of the papal *power of the keys* is supposed to be found in Matthew 16:19, where Christ, addressing Peter, said: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." This passage is also pressed into service in defense of several of Rome's associated dogmas, such as those of papal infallibility, penance, indulgences. Falsely assuming the pope to be the successor of St. Peter, they teach that therefore the supreme power of forgiveness, etc., is vested in every succeeding pope.

This is one of Rome's most dangerous traditional premises, and is fundamental to her whole system, and issues in a progeny of errors and abuses that would otherwise be inconceivable. Assuming or accepting this figment of tradition—that St. Peter was the first pope of Rome—as though it were historic fact; together with the theory that to him, and to him alone, and therefore to all his papal successors, was given the supreme power of the keys; and that the pope is infallible as the mouthpiece of Christ in all matters pertaining to the faith: there is no limit to the possibility of Rome's arrogance in subjecting the consciences of the nations. This ultimate premise is fundamental to numerous subordinate premises, which are therefore equally erroneous, and the conclusions must necessarily be false. Thus have arisen the unscriptural doctrines of *confession, penance, indulgences, prayers for the dead,* etc., upon the mere *ipse dixits* of this suppos-

edly infallible pertender and of the Councils as his equally infallible instruments or mouthpieces. But we must not anticipate our discussion on *infallibility,* except as it is necessary in our immediate discussion on the *power of the keys.*

That James the brother of the Lord presided over the apostolic Council at Jerusalem (Acts 15:13, 19, etc.); that Peter was never bishop or overseer at Rome; that the bishops or overseers at Rome had, and exercised, no more authority than did those at Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and other cities, until the time of Constantine (beginning of fourth century); that from that time on the bishop of Rome gradually arrogated to himself, and received, more and more authority till his supremacy was complete and absolute; that the succeeding and supposedly infallible popes, and pretended holders of the power of the keys, and their equally infallible Councils, repeatedly contradicted one another and thus nullified all claims to infallibility, etc.; that many of their dicta and decrees are plainly contrary to Scripture,—these are incontrovertible facts of history that need no further proof here.

Thus Rome's fundamental premises are utterly false; and, therefore, her conclusions based upon them must be false; and with them the whole system of her hierarchical pretensions must necessarily fall. In the light of these facts, what then becomes of her theory of *purgatory* which is certainly nowhere taught in Scripture, but whose supposed existence is deduced from such traditional and totally unfounded premises.

The fact is often overlooked that only a few verses after the one cited in proof of *Peter's primacy* and consequent papal *power of the keys* (Matt. 16:18-19),

when Peter tried to rebuke his Lord, Christ says to him, "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou are a stumbling-block unto me: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men" (Matt. 16:23). Then, too, in Matthew 18:18, Christ plainly delegates whatever authority is implied in these words, to all the disciples: "Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." So also, when Christ met the ten disciples on the night of His resurrection, He spoke similar words to the assembled body: "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John 20:23).

Some of Rome's apologists indeed try to avoid this dilemma by declaring that this *power of the keys* is vested in the ordained priesthood. But we clearly understand this evasion of the real issue. A priesthood without the authority of the pope, according to Rome's own pronounced contention, is an impossibility. All its authority, and therefore that of the *keys,* comes through the intermediary officials, from the pope, by virtue of his alleged *apostolic succession* (Wiseman: *Lectures,* pp. 262-263). All this boasted ecclesiastical authority, however regarded, ultimately hangs upon the unhistoric assumed figment of the *Petrine primacy and episcopate* and papal *apostolic succession.*

There is, however, a certain delegated authority or power involved in Christ's words to St. Peter and the rest of the apostles; but this power belongs to the Church as the assembly of believers—the universal priesthood—as is very evident from the last two citations (Matt. 18:18; John 20:23), and as is also noted

in what we have said about Peter with reference to the other (Matt. 16:18-19). This legitimate authority or power is, indeed, too often ignored by a radical Protestantism. But this power is conditioned upon the believer's faith, or his acceptance or rejection of grace, as is in various places plainly taught. Therefore, this power is not one arbitrarily to forgive sins, but only to *declare* God's forgiveness upon the fulfillment, on the part of the sinner, of Christ's own conditions.

The writer very well knows how some of Rome's defenders try to dodge the real question or to explain it away. To make the matter appear plausible even from a Protestant point of view, they say that this is what they do; namely, as Christ's mouthpiece, *pronounce forgiveness,* upon the sinner's fulfilling of the conditions. But, according to Rome's Confessions, by virtue of the authority delegated to them in their ordination, the priests themselves, even those "who are in mortal sins" (*Decisions of Trent,* Fourth Session, Chapter vi), have Christ's power on earth to forgive sins. Moreover, even upon the basis of their contention that they, as Christ's mouthpiece, forgive sins upon the fulfillment of the condition, their forgiveness is vain; as the ecclesiastical conditions (confession to the priest and satisfaction, to which some contrition is added) upon which they pretend to forgive, are not the same as Christ's conditions (faith in Him and His atoning sacrifice). Therefore, their forgiveness in such cases could in no way be valid. Furthermore, upon the basis of Rome's own theory of forgiveness, only those sins which are thus actually confessed would be forgiven. This would, therefore, not account for the multitudinous sins of heart and life, of omission and commission, that are not recited in the confession, not

to speak of the very state of utter sinfulness that does not always issue in conscious act.

Thus in Rome's pretended exercise of the *power of the keys* through her priesthood, she holds that *auricular confession* "is absolutely necessary and its institution divine" (*Catechism of Perseverance,* p. 220). She teaches, moreover, "Confession is the only means established by Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; for 1st, our Lord does not point out any other; 2nd, the Church knows of no other; 3d, if there were any other the power to forgive and to retain sins confided to the apostles would be vain and useless" (*Ibid.,* p. 221). This *necessity of confession* is also taught in Chapter V, Fourth Session of *Council of Trent.* See also Cardinal Gibbons' *Faith of Our Fathers,* p. 394.

Rome's explanation, indeed, is that, after conscious sins have been confessed, "other sins, which do not occur to him [the one confessing] after diligent thought, are understood to be included as a whole in that same confession" (*Trent,* Fourteenth Session, Chapter V). This is, however, only a very subtle way of avoiding a dilemma pointed out above, a mere subterfuge. Where is Rome's authority for saying that those other, unconfessed, sins are included as a whole in such confession, and are therefore forgiven with those actually confessed—that is, forgiven in God's own forgiveness and totally blotted out?

The reader will notice that this teaching of Rome is wholly without divine authority, its authority being, that the Church has practiced it and that in Council assembled she has so ruled. Moreover, Rome teaches that "if any one say . . . that the confession of the penitent is not required in order that the priest may be able to absolve him: let him be anathema (*Trent,*

Canon IX on *Penance,* Twentieth Session). This is virtually a contradiction of her explanation about unconfessed sins, given above. Here the confession of the penitent is declared to be "required in order that the priest may be able to absolve him," while according to the former passage many unconfessed sins are said to be included in the confession and forgiveness of others. But Rome would answer that in the latter quotation the word *confession* refers to the act as a whole, while in the former it means the acknowledgment of particular sins in that *confession.* But this answer would simply bring us back to the dilemma already pointed out, out of which Rome tries to extricate herself by her arrogant assumption that the Church's teaching on such points must be accepted as *infallible* and therefore *final.*

To be honest about it, even Rome would have to admit that acts of sin of which one is not conscious or which he has forgotten, could not possibly even enter as a factor into the penitence of the confessor, and could therefore not be covered, according to Rome's own theory, by the absolution of the priest, nor included in the penance of the confessor. Only by acknowledging one's inherent sinfulness, or state of sin, to God, Who alone knows all one's sins, and in faith throwing one's self upon His mercy because of the all-sufficient merits of Christ, can such forgiveness be obtained.

In this connection it is necessary also a little more fully to consider the dogma of the *infallibility* of the pope, only briefly referred to above, as this dogma is involved in, and supposedly gives considerably validity to, those considered above, as supposedly strengthening that of *purgatory.* For an explanation of this

dogma we refer to Deharbe: "Is the Pope infallible? Yes; the General Council of the Vatican, in 1870, defined that the Pope is infallible when he teaches the Church *ex cathedra.* When does the Pope speak *ex cathedra?* The Pope speaks *ex cathedra* when, in the exercise of his office as Head of the Church, and Chief Pastor and Teacher of all the faithful, he declares what is to be held by the Universal Church as the true doctrine on any matter of faith or morals" (*A Complete Catechism,* pp. 145-146). The same point is developed at length in *The Catechism Explained,* by Spirago and Clarke, pages 236-241. In the words of Cardinal Gibbons, "What, then, is the real doctrine of Infallibility? It simply means that the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, by virtue of the promises of Jesus Christ, is preserved from error of judgment when he promulgates to the Church a decision on faith and morals" (*Faith of Our Fathers,* p. 149).

On this point Bellarmine goes even so far as to make the following extreme declaration: "If the Pope should err by enjoining vices or prohibiting virtues, the Church, unless she would sin against conscience, would be bound to believe vices to be good and virtues evil." And at the time of the final establishing of this dogma, one of the official organs of the Roman Catholic Church made this declaration: "It is obligatory to hear the voice of Pius IX., when he speaks, avowedly to the universal Church, as it is to listen to the voice of Jesus Christ" (*Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register,* New York, October 1, 1870). In his Commentaries on the Decretals, Prospero Fagnini speaks of the pope's authority in the following striking words: "He may make laws and institutions for

all the world. He has power over all men, even infidels. The Pope judges all men, and can be judged only of God. He cannot be judged of councils; nay, were the whole world to pronounce in any particular against the Pope, it would be right to submit to his judgment against the world. Everything he does is done by divine authority. The Pope may, by himself alone, determine the symbols of faith, since it belongs to him only to decide in matters of faith. The Pope is not subject to the decisions of his predecessors—not even to that of the Apostles; for there is no power that can limit the power of the keys. He may dispense with the observance of the divine laws and the Gospel precepts. The Pope may grant every species of dispensation, with exception of one, to marry one's father, or one's mother. He may depose magistrates and princes, and free their subjects from their obligations to loyalty. He is king of kings and ruler of rulers; he is the prince of bishops, the judge of all men. He can create law where before there was none." And in the *Vatican Council,* the bishop of Poitiers defended *infallibility* thus: "St. Paul was beheaded; consequently his head, which represents the ordinary episcopate, was not indissolubly united to the body. St. Peter, on the contrary, was crucified with his head downwards, to show that his head, which was the image of the Papacy, sustained the whole body." His conclusion, therefore, was that the pope must be *infallible.* What transcendental logic, that the accepted rules of ordinary logic do not cover and sustain! But thus, altogether without any rational argument, was this subversive dogma of *papal infallibility* established in July, 1870, by a body of 523 pope-controlled priests.

It is surely not necessary for us to answer such arrogant assumptions. There is nothing in the whole range of God's revelation to man to sustain such preposterous claims. They are in direct conflict with both the teaching and the practice of Christ and His apostles. These exhorted their followers to be subject and obedient to the recognized civil authorities, and themselves meekly submitted to them. Whence, then, has the pope as the pretended Vicar of Christ on earth such absolute authority? Surely, only by falsely arrogating the same to himself, and by the support of his fawning and flattering college of cardinals, *et al.*, appointed by himself, or by the hierarchy, which has systematically been developed and perfected through the centuries as a vast machinery of subjugation, and of which he himself is the absolute and arbitrary head. See *power of the keys* above.

Papal infallibility and the Roman hierarchy are totally foundationless; therefore the superstructure cannot stand. The premises are false, and so must the conclusion be. What then becomes of *papal infallibility* as an alleged argument for *purgatory?* The answer is only too evident from what is said above. Further answer to the dogma itself is, therefore, not necessary for our purpose.

To sum up this sub-division, such is Rome's theory of indulgences, with their alleged efficacy for the relief of souls in an hypothetical purgatory and with their supposed source in some assumed treasury of imaginary superfluous merits of others, together with the imaginary reciprocal blessings that are alleged to come to men who have by such pretended indulgences supposedly helped other supposedly suffering souls when they themselves are supposed to be imprisoned

in that hypothetical purgatory, supposedly burning in its hypothetical flames. And the alleged power of dispensing all these imaginary superabundant merits and blessings is, in virtue of the alleged absolute supreme power of the keys, supposed to be vested in the pope as the pretended infallible successor of St. Peter, who supposedly was the first pope of Rome. And, moreover, through the pope this alleged power is supposedly exercised by the pope-controlled priests during the professedly necessary or compulsory auricular confession to them by all the laity. And, of course, Rome arrogantly declares that, in order to be saved, all must accept these theories with all their associated suppositions and pretensions as being the very oracles of God. Hence, no one need wonder at the tremendous power of Rome over the will and conscience of its millions of devotees to do her bidding!

Thus by adding to her dogmas of *purgatory, papal infallibility* and the *power of the keys*—with her arbitrary control over imaginary *human satisfactions, good works,* and *superfluous merits*—that of the *necessity of confession* to the priestly agents of the Church, Rome has developed a system of subjugation, or moral and spiritual bondage, that is absolutely tyrannical. What the terrible inquisition was to certain countries in its day, that this system of doctrine has been in a sense to the whole Roman Catholic Church throughout the world for all these centuries. The inquisition was only the visible form, or logical application of, the confessional and of those doctrines that make it so effective.

Thus, as the dogmas of *indulgences, the power of the keys, confession,* and *papal infallibility* are only unfounded assumptions, they are totally without

value as arguments in suport of the dogma of *purgatory.*

3 PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

The doctrine as to, or the practice of, *praying for the dead,* was naturally developed with those of *superabundant merits, indulgences,* etc., considered above, as those are naturally suggested by, and linked with, it. According to it, by their *prayers* the faithful can help to shorten the sufferings of their kindred and friends in *purgatory.*

In the writings of the Fathers, this doctrine or practice really antedated that of a definite idea of purgatory, which, however, it even there almost necessarily implies. It is, moreover, conversely, also naturally implied in, and almost necessitated by, the doctrine of *purgatory.* These two doctrines are, therefore, very closely associated. In the words of Cardinal Gibbons, "The existence of purgatory naturally implies the correlative dogma,—the utility of praying for the dead; for, the souls consigned to this middle state have not reached the term of their journey. They are still exiles from heaven, and fit subjects for divine clemency" (*Faith of Our Fathers,* p. 247.)

Cardinal Wiseman's words are of similar import: "To examine fully the proofs of this doctrine [of purgatory], it is necessary to connect it with another Catholic practice, that of praying for the dead. For this practice, as we shall see, is essentially based on the belief in purgatory; and consequently the principles of both are intimately connected together. Why does the Catholic pray for his departed friend, but that he fears, lest not having died in so pure a

state as to have been immediately admitted to the sight of God, he may be enduring that punishment which God has awarded after the forgiveness of his sins; and believes that through the intercession of his brethren, he may be released from that distressing situation? I have no hesitation in saying that the two doctrines go so completely together, that if we succeed in demonstrating the one, the other necessarily follows. For, if we prove that it has always been the belief in the Church of Christ, that they who are departed may be benefited by our prayers and brought to the sight of God, while the same time it has no less been its universal belief that they who had incurred eternal punishment could not be released from it, assuredly we have the same system as ours,—that there was a middle state wherein the face of God was not enjoyed, and yet eternal punishment was not suffered" (*Lectures,* pp. 382-383).

According to the *Catechism of Perseverance,* there are "four principal motives to pray for the dead. 1st. The glory of God, for whom we procure perfect adorers, by aiding the souls in purgatory to enter heaven. 2d. Charity, the souls in purgatory have a claim on our charity, because they are our brethren in Jesus Christ, and our relations and friends, according to the flesh. 3d. Justice; because some of them may be suffering on our account. 4th. Our own interest; because these souls, when delivered by our prayers, will intercede for us before God and aid us to get out of purgatory" (pp. 179-180).

As an apparently plausible argument in defense of the dogma of *prayers for the dead,* Rome's apologists appeal to an equally erroneous converse proposition;

namely, that the prayers of the departed for their friends and kindred on earth are answered (as above), and that these departed ones inspire the living to pray for them (Lepecier: *Indulgences,* pp. 49-51; Kinane: *Purgatory,* pp. 179-182; *et al.*). But, surely, such erroneous arguments can issue only in error. Erroneous premises necessarily lead to erroneous conclusions. Such reasoning is as bad as, or perhaps worse than, assuming what is to be proved in order to prove it, or reasoning in a circle.

Thus in order to bolster up Rome's upscriptural teaching concerning a temporal future punishment in *purgatory,* assumption after assumption, theory after theory, has been developed and elevated into the dignity of a dogma. There is no more foundation for the dogmas of *human satisfactions, penance, good works, works of supererogation* or *supererogatory merits, supreme papal power of the keys, auricular confession, papal indulgences,* and *papal infallibility,* as well as *prayers for the dead,* than there is for that of *purgatory.* What then becomes of the dogma of *purgatory,* which these dogmas are supposed to prove and strengthen? This of itself should even be sufficient to rule out of court Rome's teaching concerning *purgatory* as totally untenable as a supposedly established article of faith. Thus it is seen that these dogmas, being themselves unfounded, are valueless as arguments for the dogma of *purgatory,* or with which they have largely been developed, or with which they are so closely associated.

Having presented what might be called chiefly negative testimony, we shall now proceed briefly to show that the *positive testimony* of Scripture is explicitly against the dogma of *purgatory.*

V DIRECT EVIDENCE OF SCRIPTURE AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY

Considered in the light of Scripture, the doctrine of purgatory has no more foundation than those of the theoretical limbus *infantum* (the abode of unbaptized children) and *limbus patrum* (the abode of the fathers before the advent of Christ or His descent into *Hades*). These three divisions of the future world have absolutely no Scripture to support them. They rather almost seem to be cunning inventions of the fertile brains of those who would strengthen the tyrannical pretensions of the hierarchy by these manacles of moral and spiritual slavery. Even its most ardent exponents must admit that nowhere in the Bible is the existence of any of these three places directly taught or even plausibly implied.

Surely 2 Maccabees 12:43-46, already noted, can constitute no argument for purgatory as against the clear teaching of the canonical Scriptures to the contrary. The Apocryphal books may be quoted as an expression of the opinions of man of their own times, or at least of their authors, but as an expression of the mind of the Lord they are without value.

Neither dare the Fathers of the Church, nor any prevailing tradition, apart from clear Scriptural warrant, be made the basis of this or any other doctrine. To be sure, according to the Church of Rome, the teachings of the Fathers and the prevailing traditions, the decisions of the Councils and the *ipse dixit ex cathedras* of the popes as Christ's pretended mouthpiece, have equal validity with the written Word of God (Wiseman: *Lectures,* pp. 60ff.; 304ff.). But it seems needless here further to refute this claim, as

this also is based upon the absolutely false premise as to the authority of the Roman hierarchy and its great papal pretender. Since her other doctrines on these premises are Scripturally false, as already shown, her conclusions as to the equal validity of the traditions and the teachings of the Church with the Word of God must necessarily be equally false.

We can excuse, or apologize for, those early Fathers of the Church who, in consonance with some other vague theories, honestly believed in the reality of some purgatory, because theirs was not an easy task to rid themselves of various pagan ideas and traditions with which they were surrounded and amid which many of them had been brought up. But for a professed theologian and believer in the inspired Word of God, in this age enriched with centuries of Christian history and Christian thought and experience, to so do, there appears to be no excuse nor possible apology.

As already stated, at the foundation of the doctrine of purgatory there are a number of assumptions that are utterly unscriptural and erroneous. The classification of sins into mortal and venial, and the theory that, even though forgiven, the forgiven person must still make satisfaction for venial sins, and that this satisfaction must be made in purgatorial fires hereafter, if not made here, are equally false. They serve well, however, as links in the mystic chain that still enthralls half of nominal Christendom.

Forgiveness means exactly what Scripture teaches that it means, and no less. When the thief on the cross was forgiven he was a fully saved soul (Luke 23:43). So when St. Paul was converted to faith in Christ he was fully pardoned and his past sins against the Lord were completely cancelled. St. Paul plainly

declares: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). And this forgiveness is clearly *limited to this life* with its offer of salvation. St. Paul writes, 2 Cor. 6:1-2: "And working together with him we entreat also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain (for he saith [Isa. 49:8], At an acceptable time I hearkened unto thee, and in a day of salvation did I succor thee: behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation)." The same is also implied in Psalm 39:13; Matthew 16:19; 18:18. See also Matthew 12:31-32, the bearing of which upon this point has been given under *Probationism.*

Not only does probation and the possibility of forgiveness end with death, but the destiny of the soul is determined or fixed. If unforgiven, its state is one of punishment from which there is no release. No sins done in the body can, by any temporal punishment, be atoned for so as to release from punishment. On the other hand, if forgiven, the soul is exempt from all punishment for sins committed. In the case of the paralytic whom Christ healed and forgave (Matt. 9:1-8), the soul was freed from sin just as instantaneously as the body was freed from sickness. Thus the thief on the cross was forgiven and at once admitted into paradise (Luke 23:42-43). This would indeed be impossible if it had to be effected by the power of man, or by his own satisfaction, or if there were no other satisfaction; but it is affected by the power of God, Christ himself having made full satisfaction for the forgiven sins.

This brings us logically to another point in fuller proof of our statement. Forgiveness and salvation come alone through the *atoning sacrifice of Christ.*

It is by His blood we are cleansed, as it is written, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7)—not limited to original sin, but all-inclusive; "Unto him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by his blood," etc. (Rev. 1:5); "And he said to me, These are they that come out of the great tribulation, and they washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. 7:14). Surely no man can redeem another here or release him from whatever punishment he may be suffering hereafter, as it is written, "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him," etc. (Ps. 49:7-10). See also Ecclesiastes 9:5-6; Hebrews 1:3; 9:13-14; John 13:8. Forgiveness or cleansing is, however, offered to us in the Word and sacraments here. Thus Jesus says, "Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you" (John 15:3); and St. Paul writes, "Not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us, through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit" (Titus 3:5).

The righteousness of God indeed demands *justice.* But this justice can not be satisfied by the sinner himself, either by merits or by suffering; nor can it be satisfied even for him by another man, as no one can make satisfaction even for himself. All are sinners before God and equally in need of a Saviour. Therefore, the merits of one man are not, and cannot be, applied to the needs of another. Indeed, all who are saved are equally saved *by the grace of God through faith* and not by any merits of their own. That man is thus justified, is evident even from the Old Testament (Gen. 15:6, also quoted in Gal. 3:6; Heb. 2:4).

And in the New Testament it forms the glorious message of the Gospel (Rom. 3; etc.).

That man is justified by Christ *through faith,* is repeatedly taught. St. Paul says, "And by him every one that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13:39). Again, quoting Habakkuk, he writes, "For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith: as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith" (Rom. 1:17). And again, "Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:1); "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8). And the effect of this appropriation of Christ by faith is stated in the eighth chapter of Romans, as follows: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh," etc. See also John 3:15-21, 36; Acts 16:31; Rom. 3:19-31; 4:23-25; 8:33-34; Gal. 2:16-17; Titus 3:17.

Thus satisfaction was made by Christ alone and this satisfaction is all-sufficient. And this satisfaction is appropriated by the sinner to his soul's salvation by faith. The so-called merits of man are therefore not merits at all but only the outgrowth or fruits of faith. What then becomes of the doctrines of *good works, works of supererogation,* etc., appealed to in defense of that *purgatory?* Such human merits are not only

not taught in Scripture, but they minimize Christ's atoning and all-sufficient merits. Christ suffered for man's sin: and if another suffering in purgatory were necessary it would nullify the free forgiveness in Christ, while sin would be punished both in Christ and in the sinner.

Moreover, there is no passage in Scripture that teaches, or from which one could truthfully infer, the reality of a *state* of any such temporal purgatorial punishment hereafter for sins done in the body, whether forgiven or unforgiven at the time of death. But many passages are squarely against it. And this was unquestionably the Spirit-guided understanding on the part of the saints of the Bible, when they realized that their departure thither was at hand. Thus St. Stephen called upon God, saying, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (Acts 7:59). St. Simeon joyfully said, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart, Lord, according to thy word, in peace" (Luke 2:29). In a similar vein St. Paul says that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord, and while to live is Christ, to die is gain (2 Cor. 5:1-8; Phil. 1:21-23). See also 2 Tim. 1:12; 4:6-8; 1 Thess. 4:3. And Christ in His letter to the church of Smyrna says, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Rev. 2:10),—not a purgatorial fire. The Old Testament bears similar testimony, especially in its accounts of the death of Moses, Aaron, and many others. Thus God's saints about to die, or when writing about death, nowhere intimated even the possibility of such a thing as a temporal punishment or a fire of purgatory in the future world, but everywhere spoke of, or intimated, immediate transition from this sinful world to soul-blessedness and peace, a fact more fully discussed

in Chapter III. Nor do they ever manifest any fear of such punishment when about to depart.

Thus they who are forgiven or die in a state of grace, whatever their past sins, enter immediately upon a state of blessedness, even as Lazarus is said to have immediately entered into Abraham's bosom (Luke 16:22), and as Elijah was taken directly up into heaven (2 Kings 2:11).

And, of course, the Scriptures know nothing of such a *place* as *purgatory*. They speak of only two places beyond the resurrection and general judgment (Matt. 7:13-14; 25:34, 41, 46; Mark 16:16). And this is true also of the period between death and the resurrection (Luke 16:19-31, *et al.*). It has even been held by some that there is only one place between death and the resurrection, in a general way called *Hades*, but that this place is divided into *Paradise* and *Tartarus*. But this is rather reading heathen conceptions into the language of Scripture. As this is more fully discussed elsewhere (Chapter I), we shall not consider it further here. Suffice it to say that Scripture reveals not more than two abodes, one for the saved and one for the lost, both before and after the final judgment.

Moreover, as there are only *two abodes* in the future world, so also are there only *two classes* of men, as well as of angels. These two classes are spoken of as the sheep and the goats, the saved and the lost, those in Abraham's bosom or in Paradise and those in Hades, the righteous and the unrighteous, the blessed and the condemned, those in heaven and those in hell (*Gehenna*). There is no third class anywhere spoken of, as those in *purgatory*, or a fourth class in a *limbus infantum*, or a fifth class in a *limbus partum*.

We have now presented Rome's theory of purgatory

from her own statements of it. We have shown both her direct proofs for this doctrine, and her arguments for it from her associated doctrines, to be valueless and groundless. We have, moreover, shown that the Scriptures are directly and emphatically against the existence of purgatory, and that it has existence only in Rome's completed theological and ecclesiastical system. We shall, therefore, leave this theory of a supposed temporal future purgation and punishment and proceed to consider a theory that we shall show to be equally unscriptural and groundless.

CHAPTER VI

UNIVERSALISM

ARE ALL MEN FINALLY TO BE SAVED?

The theory that all men will finally be saved is a very attractive one to many people. Such universal salvation were indeed, if consistent with divine justice, a consummation devoutly to be wished. And in the develoment of this theory the wish was undoubtedly father of the thought, as it apparently is in its defense in our day.

I BRIEF OUTLINE OF ITS HISTORY

The elements of this theory are found already in the speculative period of the early Church. Thus Clement of Alexandria (fl. 200) and Origin (d. 254) held that every soul must finally be saved in the ultimate triumph of the love of God. But through the ascendency of the more orthodox or Scriptural theology of the later Fathers, like Athanasius (d. 373), Augustine (d. 430), *et al.*, those early intimations of Universalism were effectually counteracted. Nevertheless, there were individuals in probably every century of Christian history who entertained a belief in a final universal salvation.

During the closing half of the seventeenth century, and especially during the first half of the eighteenth century, this ancient theory was entertained again here and there, especially in England and America.

Even the Dunkers or German Baptists, who settled in Pennsylvania in 1719, believed in and taught a form of universal restoration. But as the specific doctrine of a denomination it is directly traceable to the Rev. James Relly (d. 1780) of London, England, whose book, entitled *The Union,* became for the time its chief theological source. It soon found able adherents also in America, where it has made considerable progress. Its first public exponent in America was the Rev. John Murray (d. 1815), a follower of Relly, who preached his first sermon in the United States on September 30, 1770. He may be called the American father of Universalism in its older and purer form. But the father of Universalism in its later and more corrupt form was the Rev. Hosea Ballou (d. 1852). He went much further in his denials than did Murray, including even the denial of the divinity of Christ. In this he was at least consistent, in following the theory to a logical conclusion. The Rev. Walter Balfour adopted the theories of Ballou and carried them to even more radical conclusions.

The Universalist denomination was organized in 1803, at Winchester, New Hampshire; but it is even today but a comparatively small ecclesiastical body. Exponents of universal salvation were, however, soon found also in various other denominations, notably in the Episcopal and Congregational churches; and even in our day there are also many exponents of it in other church bodies.

II ITS FORMS

There are several forms of this theory. According to the more extreme or radical form, sin in its effects

in this world is its own punishment, and all men therefore enter upon eternal happiness immediately after death. This theory, which may be called *Universalism proper,* has comparatively few adherents either among the clergy or among the laity.

According to the other form, which should more properly be called *restorationism,* there will indeed be some punishment in the future world, remedial in purpose; but all men will finally be saved or restored. Both forms are popularly designated *Universalism,* but it is rather this latter and prevailing form that we are here considering.

Of these two forms of the theory of Universalism there are various shades, but a consideration of these is not necessary for our purpose. Suffice it to say that Universalism of whatever form is a reaction against the orthodox doctrine that the wicked here will be punished hereafter and that this punishment will be endless.

III ITS BASIS

Universalism is confessedly based upon the natural goodness or love of God. Man is not regarded as under the wrath of God because of origin sin, except that all men are born with certain inherited incompleteness. To it, man is not really a fallen but an unfolding and developing being. And though his beginning was very low, his inherent possibilities have brought him up to the high plane of being as a coworker with God in the development and enrichment of himself and the world. And according to it, he is still moving upward in his ascending being, ever nearer toward perfection in God. Moreover, his de-

velopment is not limited to this world; but it is destined to continue throughout his whole existence.

The individual may thus be said to be saved by his own action (if the word *saved* could be applied to one not lost), in conforming his character to the will of God. And as Christ received the Spirit of God, so by striving can every man receive that Spirit. There are indeed rewards and punishments, but these serve only as means to help him attain his high end. Punishment not only here, but also for a time hereafter, is therefore a means to final salvation. Wilful disobedience may thus be punished, although the guilt be forgiven. And at death each soul enters a new plane of being; and this upward or outward step is its resurrection. Thus man's condition is not fixed at death. The soul in death is not perfected, but enters the new plane of existence as it leaves the old. Future life is, therefore, a continuation of the present life. The body does not rise literally, nor is there a general judgment in the commonly accepted sense. The passages of Scripture on these points are explained metaphorically or spiritually. It is further held that, in its new sphere, being less hampered in its opportunities for development, the soul's progress under the influence of truth and love will ultimately redeem it from sin and suffering and bring it to God and holiness.

IV ARGUMENTS IN DEFENSE OF UNIVERSALISM CONSIDERED

The theory of Universalism has been defended in various ways, some of the arguments being quite plausible when superficially viewed in their own light

alone, without regard to the explicit teaching of the Word of God elsewhere to the contrary.

1 ARGUMENT FROM GOD'S GOODNESS

Many of its teachers, in trying to defend Universalism, merely appeal to what may be called its primary postulate; namely, that universal salvation must necessarily follow from God's superabounding goodness. The goodness of God, in a sense, indeed also underlies other arguments to be noted later on. But by these men it is made the paramount and almost arbitrary cause of this supposed universal salvation. With them, the Scriptural teaching of the atonement has only a figurative meaning, the showing forth of this abounding goodness. As this defense has on its side some able exponents and considerable *apparent* Scriptural evidence, it is well to consider it somewhat at length so as better to show its inherent weakness and subtle fallacies.

Before we take up the direct teaching of Scripture upon this point, we may say that God's goodness is indeed a universally acknowledged fact. It is absolute and unerring. But to say that, because of this essential goodness of God, He does not and cannot punish the wicked, as His Word has always been understood to teach, is only begging the question. It is assuming what is to be proved or disproved. God is indeed good, and this is true of Him with reference to the future world, as well as with reference to the present world. But in the present world we have unmistakable cases of His punishment of wicked men with death; His punishment of the wicked people

before the flood (Gen. 6 and 7); of Sodom and Gomorrah, and Lot's wife (Gen. 19:23-26); of Korah (Num. 16:31-35); of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11). These are indeed exceptional cases, as God does not always thus mete out punishment in this world, but they serve as a warning to wicked people as to God's punishment for sin to be meted out hereafter.

The very facts, moreover, that not all wickedness is thus punished in this world, and that such punishments as are inflicted here are unequal and inadequate, indicates that just and adequate punishment must be meted out in the future world. Indeed, the fact of punishment here, of which we know from observation and from Revelation, is as difficult of explanation as that of punishment hereafter, which reason demands and Scripture reveals. And the evidence for that future punishment in which God's justice will be equalized, becomes all the stronger in the light of the inequalities that prevail in this world, especially the manifest sufferings of many innocent people—in many cases even caused by the wickedness of others—while oftentimes the wicked seem to be spared and to prosper. And the facts that wicked men are thus spared, or given longer lease of life and exceptional opportunities to repent, and that God makes His sun to rise upon the good and upon the evil, etc. (Matt. 5:45), only prove God's long suffering and mercy in manifestation of His love while men are still in this world of probation and possible grace. But exponents of Universalism conform the dealings of the heavenly Father with His creatures to those of an indulgent and erring human parent, forgetting that God's justice is unerring and that its scope and purpose are infinite and eternal.

These men contend that the very nature of the Gospel implies unlimited goodness, and therefore unlimited mercy. They hold that this is involved in the message of the angel to the shepherds upon Judaea's hills, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people" (Luke 2:10). However, the fact that the good tidings of great joy are meant for all people does not in the least imply that all people will accept them and be saved. These men fail to make full application of the parable of the *prodigal son.* The father's love for his son was indeed great, and he longed to have his son come back. But that did not bring back the son *against his will.* They must not forget the man who had not on a wedding garment (Matt. 22:11-13); Christ's own account of the judgment (Matt. 25:41-46); and many other passages. Indeed, the Saviour Himself distinctly teaches that not all will thus be saved, as for example in Matthew 13:49-50, "So shall it be in the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth." See also Matthew 8:11-12; 13:41-42; Luke 13:23-29.

The Gospel does not cease to be gospel or good news because some men accept it not and do not profit by its message. The good news of an invitation to a royal feast does not cease to be such because certain invited guests decline the invitation or refuse to eat. The glad tidings of pardon, upon condition of allegiance and obedience, for guilty rebels condemned to die, are indeed meant to announce to them salvation from death. Nor does their refusal of allegiance and obedience invalidate the good intention of the mes-

sage or the goodness of the king. Their refusal does not, therefore, make it a message of death and thus impeach the justice of the king. It simply leaves them under the just sentence of death under which they were before the message was sent to them. To argue, moreover, that the love of God is equal to all, has no weight, as by wilfully rejecting that love a man can make that love of none effect. To save a man against his will would not only make him a mere machine, but it would also make love cease to be love.

A passage often quoted by exponents of Universalism is Revelation 21:4, "And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more: the first things are passed away." This will indeed be true of the saved, of those who have accepted grace and become God's saints. But that some will be lost and that the above passage therefore does not refer to all men is clear from verses 7 and 8 following: "He that overcometh shall inherit these things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But for the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, their part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." The evidence of these two verses is so overwhelming that further comment on this particular point is unnecessary. Indeed, of all the books in the New Testament there is none more explicitly against Universalism than is the book of Revelation. Its use in defense of the theory of universal salvation is, to say the least, hazardous, as all such passages concerning the saved are contrasted with equally emphatic passages concerning the lost.

What is said of the above passages is equally true of Isaiah 25:8, often quoted by Universalists: "He hath swallowed up death for ever; and the Lord Jehovah will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the reproach of his people will he take away from off all the earth: for Jehovah hath spoken it." The use of this passage for Universalism is also strikingly nullified by verses 10-11.

Among other passages of Scripture cited in proof of this supposed universal salvation as the result of the superabounding goodness of God, are those that speak of the *desire* of God that all men might be saved. Thus they quote St. Paul's words, that God our Saviour "would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2:4). So also do they quote St. Peter, that the Lord is longsuffering, "not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Peter 3:9). And even in the Old Testament do they find such passages, as for example, "As I live, saith the Lord Jehovah, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live" (Ezek. 33:11). These passages indeed do express that which underlies the whole Gospel message; namely, that God *desires* all men to repent and live. That was the impelling motive, prompted by His infinite love, in sending His Son to save the world. God indeed has no more pleasure in the death of the sinner than He has in his sin; and yet, in spite of God's hatred of sin, sin stands out as an incontrovertible fact. And this fact is not only observed on every hand, but it is also either explicitly stated or clearly implied throughout the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation. He has made infinite *provision* for the salvation of the sinner

and is far more willing to save him than the sinner himself is to accept God's offer of salvation; but this provision and willingness on the part of God to save the sinner do not and cannot save him against his will. To do so would in effect be equivalent to dehumanizing man, or to placing him, an otherwise supposedly free moral and responsible agent, upon the plane of a fate-controled automaton. These Scripture passages, therefore, do not afford any evidence for the doctrine of universal salvation or restoration, and especially so in the light of many other passages, indeed of the whole underlying tenor of Scripture, to the contrary. They show only what is the keynote of the whole Gospel; namely, God's impelling love toward a fallen race, His consequent *provision* in Christ Jesus for the salvation of all who will believe in Him and accept His amply provided grace and be saved. Indeed, these very passages, expressive of His willingness that all should be saved, unmistakably imply the fact that many against their own eternal interests reject His proffered grace and are, therefore, lost.

To argue, moreover, that future punishment would not be *consistent* with the *general goodness* of a merciful God, is simply to read into His justice the weaknesses of an overindulgent human father, that often make him yield to the child's wishes in gross defiance of actual justice. To argue that future punishment would be unjust is to pretend to know all God's purposes in the whole order in general and in all punishment in particular. One might as well object to all trial and suffering in this life, and indeed to God's permission of any evil whatsoever, as to object to future punishment, the decree for which is written

clear and large across the whole compass of His revelation, including even that of His fatherly love and goodness.

But some have gone to the extent of so extending God's goodness into the future world as to offer to those who depart this life a second probation hereafter. They hold that in the disembodied state upon which souls enter after death, and in the light of their former life's experience and then more immediate and therefore better understanding of God and of self and of the true nature of the spiritual world and of their own best interests, this second probation with its second offer of the Gospel would necessarily be improved by them to their final salvation. Dorner thus makes the following statement: "Christian grace is designed for human beings, not for inhabitants of earth. . . . Jesus seeks the lost—lost may be sought also in the kingdom of the dead. . . . A proof that, according to the New Testament the time of grace does not by a universal law expire with death, is found in Christ's raising of the dead; e. g., the youth of Nain received by being raised from the dead a prolonged term of grace, through which Christ's love became first known to him" (*Future State,* pp. 101-102). Even Julius Müller held that salvation will be offered hereafter to those souls to whom such offer did not come here.

To say, as Dorner does, that "Christian grace is designed for human beings, not for inhabitants of earth," is not only without any direct Scripture warrant whatever, but it is even in direct contradiction of the words of St. Paul, "Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor.

6:2). For a fuller discussion of this point see chapter on *Probationism.* Dorner's second statement, "Jesus seeks the lost—lost may be sought also in the kingdom of the dead," is equally without foundation. The passages of Scripture that bear upon this point, in their content and connection, plainly refer this seeking of Jesus to this world. He says to Zacchaeus, "Today is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:9-10). He said, moreover, that He came to seek and to save that which *was* lost, not that which *will be* lost in the *future* world. The same is also evident from Matthew 18:11, although this verse, it should be said, does not have good manuscript authority. Other passages referring to Christ's coming to this world and the purpose of His coming, when read in connection with their contexts, amply confirm the fact that His grace is meant for, and limited to, this world.

With reference to Dorner's third point, namely, that Christ's raising of the dead is a proof that the time of grace does not expire with death, we may say that such cases were miraculous exceptions to the general law. It is therefore manifestly impossible from such cases to draw the conclusion that salvation extends into the future world. Indeed, as the cumulative evidence of Scripture is overwhelmingly against such a conclusion, the speculative argument from the cases cited loses all its force in proof of a possible future restoration. Surely, as the cases of Christ's raising of the dead were miraculous exceptions in the natural or physical order, so must they likewise have been in the spiritual or psychic order, all ethical suppositions or objections to the contrary notwithstand-

ing. But the objection is made that a miracle in the moral sphere, in such cases as for instance the withholding of judgment or of final decision as to destiny until the persons died again, would be "destructive of all faith." This is, however, a mere assumption. It is falsely to presume that our faith as to what might or will be in the moral or spiritual sphere, is in full correspondence with, and comprehensive of, all the moral and spiritual dealings of the absolute and omnipotent God. Moreover, raising the question as to which death in the case of those raised, the first or the second, must have been followed by judgment (Dorner: *Future State,* p. 102, Note 3), leads only to empty speculation. And to say that the fact of such two deaths must compel us to accept a state of probation at least between these two deaths, and therefore also in the spiritual world, is to try to press a conclusion which is not in the premises. And, indeed, the implied premises themselves are largely assumptions. Therefore, such reasoning is not only without Scriptural foundation and wholly inconclusive, but it is also illogical, and utterly without weight in the light of God's express declarations in many parts of His Word to the contrary.

But we must not be understood to classify Dorner among professed Universalists; for with Universalism as such, and especially as the body of doctrine held by the sect known by that name in America and England, that great German theologian had little sympathy. The superficial and unscriptural theology of American Universalism in particular did not appeal to such great minds as Dorner, Schliermacher and Tholuch, although Universalism finds some points in the writings of such men which it draws upon to bolster up

its erroneous premises. Thus, while Tholuch was at first sympathetic toward Universalism before he really knew its teachings and discovered its negations and fallacies, and even entered into correspondence with T. J. Sawyer of New York, when he came to understand its real nature he not only disowned any connection with or sympathy for it, but he refused further correspondence with Mr. Sawyer.

Exponents of Universalism quote also 1 Peter 3:19-20 and 4:6, about the so-called preaching to those in prison. This is one of Nitzsch's favorite arguments in proof of a possible salvation after death. But that these passages are not at all applicable to the subject under immediate consideration, and therefore without any value for their contention, is shown in the chapter on *Probationism.* Indeed, not only are these passages fully discussed there, but the whole subject of an hypothetical future probation. Nothing, therefore, need be said here in addition to what is said there, except to answer the objections and arguments of those who in behalf of *Universalism* defend the theory of a universal future probation.

In this connection, therefore, we must cite the philosophic or ethical argument against endless future punishment; namely, that no limit in time for a possible repentance and salvation can be put upon man as a *free moral agent.* Therefore, it is contended, man's will must necessarily be left free in the future world, so as to continue his identity and God-given personality, whether in a state of blessedness or of punishment; and hence he might before and even after the judgment—and perhaps must necessarily—choose for God and light and salvation. This argu-

ment is based upon the false assumption, that man's will is left free after death and after the judgment. On the contrary, in the future state the will of the condemned will be included in the soul's subjugation, as is evident from 1 Corinthians 15:24-26 and Philippians 2:9-11, to be considered a little later in this chapter. The will which here in the state of grace wilfully refused to yield to the gracious will of a merciful Father, will there be subjugated to that infinite will, leaving it impotent or helpless, so that God will be all in all. In fact, from the whole tenor of revelation, it appears that the moral freedom of lost souls will cease with death, and therefore necessarily their state of probation.

This whole argument for universal salvation from the superabounding goodness of God is emphatically answered by the merciful and ever blessed Saviour Himself. The answer referred to is absolute and final, and whatever interpretation of the contents may be given by the objector, does not in the least affect its own unanswerableness. The Saviour solemnly declares that the sin and blasphemy against the Holy Ghost will not be forgiven unto men; and to make this statement all the more emphatic, He adds, "neither in this world, nor in that which is to come" (Matt. 12:32). Thus, though forgiveness is mercifully granted in this life to the penitent sinner—but to the penitent alone—for any other sins, yet for the sin against the Holy Ghost no forgiveness is granted to the sinner, who can no longer even be penitent. Hence even upon the preposterous supposition that all other sinners would some time during their lives become penitent and accept Christ's sacrifice and thus receive forgiveness and be saved, there would yet even then remain these sin-

ners against the Holy Ghost, who would continue forever to remain under the condemnation of God. With reference to this sin it is emphatically said, "As touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame" (Heb. 6:4-6). Again, "If we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins" (Heb. 10:26). See also 1 John 5:16; Luke 12:10; Mark 3:29. When these passages are read in the light of Matthew 25:41-46, together with what is said under *Eternalism*, the futility of this argument for a universal restoration is seen in all its cumulative force.

2 ARGUMENT FROM CHRIST'S ATONEMENT

Quite a number of writers hold that the *atonement* of Christ is so *all-sufficient* that all must necessarily ultimately be saved. And in thus ostensibly holding to the atonement as their ground of hope for a universal salvation or restoration, these men seemingly approach more nearly to the true Scriptural view than do the rest, but without making allowance for a possible rejection or non-appropriation of that atonement on the part of the individual. In all fairness it should, however, be said that but few of those who appeal to this argument in defense of a universal salvation could, or would want to, be classed among Universalists. They cannot accept Universalism with its arbitrary negations and its fallacies. They are

mostly men of other and more orthodox religious persuasions, who fondly entertain the hope that *perhaps somehow* all will eventually be saved by the sacrifice of Christ. Many of these men seem to be quite orthodox in general, yet on this particular point they allow truth to give way to sentiment and even try to defend their position by an appeal to other accepted truth. Because of its apparent Scripturalness, this defense should in all fairness be somewhat fully given and should be very carefully examined. And, indeed, this is all the more necessary because it is very subtle and consequently misleading.

As a philosophic hypothesis, it is held that, in the last analysis, all men are equal sinners before God and by nature equally lost. Therefore, it is contended, a divinely proffered method of redemption should, in its application, necessarily have equal effects upon all, and result in equal salvation. If this were not so, it is said, then God's purposes would be attained in some and lost in others, which would be a contradiction and therefore a divine impossibility. But the efficacy of the operation of God's grace in the sinner's conversion is not to be measured by the relative ratios of God's power to men's sins; but it is dependent upon men's faith or willingness to accept that grace. This power in man of rejecting or accepting is what makes him a free personality, and without this his very glory as man would be lost. This philosophic hypothesis must therefore be uncompromisingly rejected as false and totally inapplicable in the resolution of the problem of human salvation.

The Scripture passages cited in defense of the view, that Christ's atonement is so all-sufficient that all men must necessarily be saved, are, of course, those that

teach the central doctrine of the atonement. Thus Genesis 22:18 is cited, "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." But this passage expresses only what all fully accept; namely, that all the nations as nations shall receive the Gospel and of its blessings, and that all who believe shall be saved. The Gospel shall not be limited to one nation, as was the Mosaic law, but no nation is to be excluded from its benefits. The law was for the Jewish nation in preparation for the coming Messiah; but the Gospel of that Messiah, prophesied to arise among the Jews, shall be for all nations. And equally inapplicable as an argument is Genesis 3:15. In appealing to the New Testament for further proof as to this point, it is held that the expression in John 1:29 is all-inclusive, "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" The same is said of Romans 5:18, "So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life"; and of 1 Corinthians 15:22, "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." In the last quotation, it is, of course, the bodily resurrection that is spoken of. Again, in 2 Corinthians 5:14-15, Christ is said to have "died for all," and it is therefore contended that all must be saved. In like manner, 1 Timothy 2:6 is quoted, "Who gave himself a ransom for all," as well as 1 Timothy 4:10, where God is said to be the "Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe." Another citation is Hebrews 2:9, where Christ is spoken as of tasting of "death for every man," as also is 1 John 2:2, "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world."

When considered by themselves apart from their contexts and without the light of the analogy of Scripture, these passages would seem to afford some plausible evidence for universal salvation. But Scripture passages must not thus be studied and interpreted apart from their contexts, which constitute their proper setting, and therefore their only rightful basis of interpretation. And such passages thus separated, dissociated or isolated, can surely never be so interpreted as to be in conflict with the more explicit teachings of Scripture elsewhere, or with the whole analogy of Scripture. The fact is that the passages cited, when read in the light of their contexts and of other explanatory passages, only bring into bold relief the great truth of the universal *provision* for the salvation of all men. This provision is indeed so universal as to be all-inclusive, but only upon the oft-repeated simple condition of faith in, or acceptance of, that provision in the atoning Saviour. This condition is definitely expressed in John 3:16, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life."

The absurdity of wresting a passage of Scripture from its context is clearly seen in the case of John 3:17, "For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him." Considered alone, this verse can indeed be pressed into service by Universalism, as teaching that all men must be saved, as this would seem here even to be emphasized by the very antithetical form of the statement, in explicitly expressing the purpose for which Christ came. But, surely, such merely apparent meaning is just as emphatically cor-

rected in the very next verse which also clearly sets forth the *condition* above noted: "He that believeth on him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God." This condition is also very emphatically stated in Mark 16:16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned"; in Luke 13:3, "Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish"; in John 6:40, "This is the will of my Father, that every one that beholdeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have eternal life." See also John 5:24; 6:47; 20:31; Romans 5:1; Galatians 2:16.

Indeed, what right has Universalism even to appeal to those passages of Scripture which speak of Christ as Saviour or which teach the doctrine of the atonement? To be sure, the above passages are referred to as rather the defense of those who are not *professed* Universalists, as we noted in introducing this argument. But Universalism itself also appeals to these passages because of the apparent all-inclusiveness of their language, however it may try to explain, or explain away, their manifest teaching of the atonement.

It must not be forgotten that according to Universalism man is not a *fallen* being and that Christ's death was therefore *not necessary* to salvation. But even Universalists must admit that the Bible teaches that Christ *died for man.* He surely did not come and die to save us from physical death, as it is a patent fact that all must die. Nor did He come and die to save us from sin to be committed hereafter, for they also admit that there will be no sin in the future world. And if it be held that He came to save *from sinning* here, then we point to the fact that no man has ever

been without sin on this side of death. Again, if Universalists contend that Christ came and died to save from the *effects* of sin, we ask, How then can they hold that the sinner himself is punished either altogether in this life or for a limited time hereafter? Christ's death would thus be made of no effect. Indeed, much depends upon the definition of sin, for to Universalism *sin* is not *sin* in the sense of Scripture. Hence *salvation* and the *Saviour* are not the *salvation* and the *Saviour* of Scripture. Christ truly died for all, but His death saves only those who accept His atoning sacrifice. All are potentially atoned for, but not all are actually saved, because of the rejection of the atonement by some. If Christ had not died all would remain spiritually dead and be eternally dead and lost; but in Christ's death all that are in Christ by faith are saved and live.

This argument for universal salvation from the all-sufficiency of Christ's atonement, has, therefore, no weight. Christ's atonement is indeed all-sufficient, the provision is indeed ample; but this of itself will save no one apart from the condition.

3 ARGUMENT FROM THE OMNIPOTENCE OF GOD

Another argument in defense of this doctrine of universal restoration is based upon the omnipotence, or ultimate triumph, of God and good. It is contended that, if God is omnipotent, He could have created man for eternal happiness, and that, if He did not so create man, He could not be perfectly good and just. So also it is contended that if God *could* not have created man for eternal happiness, then He would not be omnipotent. Therefore it is held as a necessary conclusion

that as God is apparently both omnipotent and perfectly good, He must have created man for eternal happiness.

Such reasoning, upon its surface, seems rather plausible; but upon further examination, it is seen to be very subtly fallacious and altogether inapplicable as an argument for universal salvation. In the first place, it is very true that God did thus create man for eternal happiness. The creation in itself was therefore not at fault, nor were God's omnipotence and goodness compromised or violated in that creation. But man's created potential or essential happiness was marred by the entrance of the accident of sin. Therefore, as this is not part of man's created or essential nature, his creation was not at fault nor can God's goodness and omnipotence be impeached. The fact is, moreover, universally acknowledged that *man in this world is not altogether happy* or what he was unquestionably designed to be, and yet even few Universalists would therefore argue against the fact of God's omnipotence and goodness. Hence their argument that future happiness or salvation for all must necessarily be involved in God's infinite power and goodness, is utterly without point or force.

In the second place, who is to be judge even as to the truth of the proposition above given to prove that man must necessarily be created for happiness and that therefore nobody could be eternally punished and lost? By what or whose standard of goodness and power can any one thus dogmatize about limitations in the power and goodness of the infinite and absolute God? Shall we bring the unlimited God down to the limitations of man and ascribe to Him either weakness or evil? It would be well for the objector to read

Paul's striking words, as recorded in Romans 9:14-24: "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. . . . O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why didst thou make me thus?" etc.

To strengthen their argument these men quote St. St. Paul's statement in 1 Corinthians 15:24-26: "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For He must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death." Even the great Schliermacher quotes this passage against the doctrine of endless punishment. Another favorite quotation is Phillippians 2:9-11: "Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." To the same end also is quoted Isaiah 45:23: "By myself have I sworn, the word is gone forth from my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."

Of these passages we may briefly say that they indeed point to the ultimate triumph of Christ and of His truth. But it is to be a *triumph,* and as such it means the supreme exaltation of Christ; but these passages do not say that this triumph is to consist in the salvation of all men, nor in the utter *annihilation* of all evil and of the enemies of the Lord and of His truth. No, it is clear that this triumph is to be one of

subjugation, as the expression "under his feet" clearly implies. Indeed, the very devils in hell bow at the name of Jesus and confess "that Jesus Christ is Lord," even as we are told, "The demons also believe, and shudder" (James 2:19). But there is a vast difference between this historic faith of devils and the saving faith of believers as children of God. So likewise is there a vast difference between the bowing of the knee at the name of Jesus and the confessing "that Jesus Christ is Lord," on the part of Christ's enemies, including even the devils, and on the part of God's children who accept Christ's salvation. In the final triumph of Christ and His truth, all will indeed bow the knee at the name of Jesus, and all will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. Those who have willingly submitted here and accepted His proffered grace, will count it infinite joy to bow and confess yonder; those who have refused to submit and accept His grace here will in compelled subjugation have to bow and confess hereafter. So of all the fallen angels. But in the case of both the saved and the lost it must necessarily be to the glory of God the Father, the supreme Consummator. No enemies of God will any longer assert themselves against Him nor against Christ and His completed and perfected kingdom. The *resisting power* of evil will forever be suppressed. The power of God will be supreme in all things. But this does not in the least imply the ultimate salvation, or annihilation, of the lost, nor the absolute destruction of all evil. Indeed, as to Isaiah 45:23-24, St. Paul clearly refers this passage to the last judgment of both the righteous and the wicked, in the following words: "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, to me every knee

shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God" (Rom. 14:10-11).

Vainly have Universalists attempted to explain away this very clearly revealed final *suppression* of the power of evil and the *subjugation* of sinners. Thus Dr. Marion T. Shutter even suggests, "The rhetoric of destruction applied to sinners may be interpreted as meaning their destruction as sinners, not as souls" (*Justice and Mercy*, p. 218); that is, by making them as rebels *loyal*. A passage quoted on this line of defense is Colossians 1:20: "And through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens." This passage, however, rather emphasizes the universality of the Gospel and points forward especially to its universal spread. It certainly does not mean that all will accept that Gospel offer and be saved, as the succeeding verses clearly set forth: "And you (Colossians), being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death . . . if so be that ye continue in the faith, grounded and steadfast, and not moved away from the hope of the gospel which ye heard," etc. (Col. 1:21-23). Here this reconciliation or salvation is explicitly limited by conditions showing that some are not reconciled or saved; and the condition is clearly set forth; namely, continuing "In the faith, grounded and steadfast" and abiding in the "hope of the gospel" which they had heard. If these conditions had not been complied with, they would not thus have been reconciled or saved. This passage, in the light of its context, therefore, instead of making for universal salvation, is really seen to be

for a salvation limited by faith in Christ; and the clear implication is that all who are without that faith will be lost.

Nor do Peter's words in Acts 3:21, concerning a final "restoration of all things," constitute an argument for the point we are considering, especially in the light of a multitude of other passages to the contrary. This passage of a general restoration does not imply the salvation of every individual soul. Indeed, that it is not in the least meant to teach such salvation is very evident from verse 23, "And it shall be, that every soul that shall not hearken to that prophet (Christ), shall be utterly destroyed from among the people." And if it be contended that this means simply death here with the possibility of salvation hereafter, or even perhaps of annihilation, we would refer the reader to the chapters on *Probationism* and *Annihilationism* for an answer. There will indeed be a "restoration of all things," or a final consummation. But this will be a consummation of God's purposes and hence of all the prophecies concerning Christ as King and Lord and concerning His Kingdom; and these prophecies include not only the salvation of believers and the glorious triumph of Christ and of His truth, but also the subjugation of all His foes and the vindication of His unerring justice.

Of Old Testament passages often quoted on this point, such as Psalm 22:27; 86:9; etc., it is hardly necessary for us to speak, after having shown the passages of the fuller New Testament revelation, often cited, to be clearly against it. These Old Testament passages must be considered in the light of the New Testament, as prophetic of the universal sway of the Gospel of Christ among the nations as nations, not

among individuals as individuals, before the final consummation. Indeed, in those days the emphasis was placed upon nations rather than upon individuals composing the nations. Though the ends of the earth or the nations are thus spoken of as some time turning unto the Lord and worshiping, that does not mean that all the individuals will do so; and, even if doing so, if that were possible, that they would all finally be saved. And when read in the light of what has been shown to be the teaching of the New Testament —indeed in the light of both law and Gospel—these Old Testament passages lose all force as evidence for universal salvation.

This argument from the omnipotence and ultimate triumph of God and good is thus shown to have no value for the contention that all men will be saved. It really lends its weight of evidence to the side of the doctrine of endless future punishment for the wicked, so explicitly taught elsewhere.

4 ARGUMENT FROM SUPPOSED PHILOSOPHIC NECESSITY

There are some thinkers who contend that whatever happens does so because it was to be, and that therefore whatever is, is right. And indeed many who are not professed determinists would nevertheless fain hide their *life* behind such a doctrine. According to philosophic determinism, all things, including human acts of good and evil, must be considered as the results or effects of the operations of irresistible laws. Necessity, not free will, is thus held to determine what we ordinarily call acts of sin. Such acts of sin could, therefore, not be punished by a just God; and hence all must be saved.

This contention is, however, so manifestly in con-

flict with even our own consciousness of voluntary choice between good and evil, that it hardly requires an answer. The history of the individual, as well as that of the race, is a history of acts resulting from conscious free choice, or expressions of free will. And the data of consciousness, and of history and experience, as to moral freedom, are amply confirmed by the Word of God. The very first account of man in Eden is one involving a choice between good and evil (Gen. 2:16-17; 3:1-24). This freedom of choice and action is everywhere either taught or implied, and is especially apparent in the many warnings, as well as in the promises, of Scripture. This argument has, therefore, no validity.

5 ARGUMENT FROM THE JUSTICE OF GOD

Some of the exponents of Universalism contend that even the justice of God is against an endless future punishment and that it necessarily implies the ultimate salvation of all people.

The contention that God's justice could not be sustained if some were saved and others were eternally lost and punished, and that such punishment of the latter would not even satisfy that justice, is wholly without foundation. Who has risen to the heights where these subjects are native, so that he can reason from absolutely known premises to unerring conclusions? Yes, there is One who has thus risen, or rather who came from and returned to that transcendent sphere where all premises not only are accessible and clear for unerring deductions, but where premises and conclusions blend, to the enraptured *immediate* vision, into perfect oneness. That One is He who Himself is the Light, Jesus the Christ of God, who was and is

and forever will be the same (Heb. 13:8), God the Son, blessed forever. And His revelation is emphatic that some men will thus be lost because of their own wilful rejection of His grace, and therefore will be punished, while others will be saved. Nor is their acquiescence in their own punishment necessary to establish its justice; and yet even that their punishment is just they must necessarily acknowledge, and this is virtual acquiescence. This argument, therefore, falls by its own weight.

It is further held that the punishment should be as, or in proportion to, the crime or sin, and therefore that an eternal punishment for a temporal sin would be in conflict with the justice of God. It is, moreover, contended that, even waiving the principle that the punishment should exactly correspond to the crime, it would nevertheless be unjust for the duration of future punishment to be the same for all the wicked, as would necessarily be the case if it were eternal. This equality of duration of future punishment for great and small sinners, it is thus held, would be unjust, because supposedly not an equitable distribution of penalties.

It is even contended by some that adequate punishment is already meted out in this life, and that it would therefore be in conflict with the justice of God to inflict *any* punishment hereafter. This, it is claimed, is taught in Proverbs 11:31, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; how much more the wicked and the sinner!" But this passage would just as much, upon such an interpretation, indicate that the righteous would have no happiness hereafter as that the wicked and the sinner would receive no punishment. Then, too, it is a fact seen on

every side, that if there is any inequality of trial, suffering and sorrow, between the righteous and the wicked in this world, it is clearly often in favor of the wicked. What then becomes of the contention that the wicked receive their punishment here? How could the so-called punishment of the righteous here, which in many cases would have to be regarded as greater than that of the wicked, be justified? Indeed, this very inequality is one of the strongest presumptive evidences that the wicked will receive their punishment hereafter. Justice and equity would thus *demand* the punishment of the wicked hereafter. Surely, if they are not punished here—or as that punishment must be regarded as not equitable—their punishment hereafter must necessarily follow from the very law of justice to which exponents of Universalism appeal. Therefore, this argument from the justice of God is clearly against Universalism upon the very basis of the contention of its own advocates.

If, moreover, all punishment were meted out in this world, then the atoning death of Christ would not only be of none effect, but it would have been superfluous and in reality a contradictory absurdity. For, if adequate punishment were thus meted out to the sinner, it would have been unjust, and even absurd, also for Christ to die for those sins. The same would even be true if such adequate punishment were inflicted hereafter until justice would be satisfied and the sinner finally saved. Indeed, if all would thus have to satisfy justice by suffering punishment, then the term *salvation* would not even apply. Hence it is that Universalists have little difficulty to deny the precious doctrine of the atonement.

It is thus seen that future and even endless punish-

ment is not only not in conflict with the justice of God, as Universalists claim, but that it is exactly what that justice *demands*. We shall therefore pass on to a consideration of another argument used in defense of Universalism.

6 ARGUMENT FROM SUPPOSED SYMPATHY OF THE SAVED WITH THE LOST

Some men hold that all must be saved in order that the blessed may be happy and without any feeling of sorrow for any, especially for those near of kin, who might be lost, and even perhaps partly by their neglect or sin. Even the philosophic theologian Schliermacher contended that the sympathy of the saved with the lost is against the possibility of an endless punishment. But this is to read into man's existence in the future world the limited social relationships and human passions that prevail in the present sense-bound physical world.

The Saviour's answer to the Sadducees should suggest for this argument a sufficient answer: "The sons of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: for neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection" (Luke 20:34-36). Thus there will be no distribution into families in the future world, so necessary in this life. Physical family instincts will give way in the blessed, by immediate understanding, to full acquiescence in the doings of Him who is unerringly just. As redeemed and glorified children of God, they will *directly know* His will and justice to be unerring. And, there-

fore, not only will His will be done in heaven as it should be done on earth, but it will also be accepted by all there with joy and rejoicing to the glory of God and the profounder happiness and blessedness of His saints. Moved by what might be called a perfectly enlightened and sanctified higher patriotism, their undivided devotion will be to the Kingdom of their perfectly holy King and Lord and to His unerring righteousness. Thus all ties between the saved and the lost will be broken in their separation into, and abode in, separate spheres. This argument from *sympathy* is thus seen to have no validity.

7 ARGUMENT FROM THE VERY NATURE OF SCRIPTURE UPON THIS POINT

Some believers in universal restoration take refuge behind the further contention that the Scriptures rather state the matter of future punishment hypothetically, as a mere possibility, but that after all none will finally be lost. Indeed, some eminent men who are not professed Universalists have appealed to this argument in trying to establish at least the *possibility* of universal salvation.

In line with this contention apparently is Dr. Dorner's interpretation of certain passages of Scripture, such as Revelation 14:9-11 and 20:10 and 15 *(Future State,* p. 117). He declares that all this "affirms nothing of persons, but of the principle." Much as we honor Dorner as a philosophic theologian, this reasoning is not even reasonable. To make these passages refer to principles instead of to persons, is to divert them from their very intended purpose—as a warning to sinners, not to principles. A principle is indeed implied or involved, but this would here not even

have existence apart from persons to whom the principle is applied and with whom it is associated. Indeed, to say that these passages affirm "nothing of persons, but of the principle," is to say that the principle is to receive a "mark on his forehead," to "drink of the wine of the wrath of God," and to be "tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb," and to have the smoke of its torment ascend "for ever and ever," and to "have no rest day and night" (Rev. 14:9-11); and to be "cast into the lake of fire and brimstone" and to be "tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20:10). We have indeed made an extreme application of such an interpretation by applying it to the parts quoted; but in so doing the interpretation will be seen all the more clearly to be untenable.

It is thus seen that the above passages unmistakably refer to persons—wicked men and the devil. Then, too, in the historico-prophetic form of the statements (for they are statements) in Revelation 20:10 and 15, the devil and lost human beings are spoken of in the past tense (Greek aorist) to have thus been cast into the lake of fire. This historic form of a prophecy or future fact does not only imply its possibility, but it undeniably indicates its unfailing future actuality. Thus even this argument for universal restoration is found to be based upon what has no existence in reality. And, therefore, to yield to the evident and emphatic teaching of Scripture and the dictates of unprejudiced human reason against universal salvation, is not only the only alternative, but it is even honorable because it is at least consistent.

To contend, morever, that all lost human beings, and even the devil, will ultimately be delivered after

suffering due punishment for all their sins, would not only be minimizing the gravity of sin in general, but it would be magnifying the sinner's own ability to atone even for a sin which the omnipotent God Himself is emphatically said not to forgive (Matt. 12:31-32). With all due respect to the memory of the elder Dorner, who sugested such a possible self-atonement for even the unpardonable sin, by enduring punishment for an indefinite time hereafter *(Future State,* p. 119), we cannot too emphatically say that he was here resorting to mere philosophic speculation, instead of accepting at its face value or most evident meaning, the Word of Him who alone speaks with authority on this transcendent subject. And yet even the conclusions of proud philosophy, when pressed a little further for a final answer, are against Dorner's own position, as we have shown under *Probationism.* We shall therefore leave this argument for universal salvation as sufficiently answered; and in this answer even the endlessness of the punishment of the unrepentant sinner is already implied.

8 ARGUMENT FROM HISTORY AND TRADITION

Another element in the defense of the theory of universal salvation is what might be termed the historic or traditional argument, or the argument from authority—chiefly from the writings of the early Church.

This was one of the favorite arguments of Dean Farrar. Among many who have adopted this argument, Dr. Shutter accepts it with all its unhistoric assumptions. These men claim that the doctrine of a possible universal salvation was the accepted belief

in the early Church. To prove their contention they quote from certain of the early Church Fathers, and cite statements to this effect from works on the early history of the Church. They thus attempt to show that the doctrine of endless punishment was not generally accepted even till the beginning of the sixth century. They contend that Tertullian of Carthage (fl. 200) was the first who believed or taught this doctrine. Upon this point Dr. Shutter, after quoting from Farrar and Thayer in proof of his contention, says: "Tertullian enjoyed the unenviable notoriety of introducing into the thought of Christendom the dogma which has ever since been the disgrace of theology and the stumbling-block of thousands of honest souls. Bear in mind, and never forget, that it was Tertullian and not Jesus who lighted the fires of hell that the Church has preached for centuries. It was the furious and vengeful African and not the gentle Nazarene who invented the creed of terror and despair" *(Justice and Mercy,* pp. 108-109). For an answer from the Scriptures that the statement that Tertullian and not Jesus taught the doctrine of endless punishment, see Chapter on *Eternalism,* where Christ's authorship is clearly demonstrated, Shutter's statement to the contrary notwithstanding.

In trying to trace and state the circumstances under which the dogma of endless punishment took its rise, with quotations from several writers, Dr. Shutter adds, "Thus hand in hand went the exclusiveness of the Church in this world and the doctrine of unending retribution in the next. Bigotry here and hell hereafter were inseparable companions" *(Justice and Mercy,* p. 113). Then he even tries to trace the increase of insanity, the rise of asceticism, persecutions

for heresy and the granting of indulgences, to this doctrine.

This contention that the theory of universal salvation was the accepted belief of the early Church, is so contrary to the general opinion on this subject, that at first acquaintance it affords not a little occasion for surprise. And indeed one is naturally surprised to find at least a man like Farrar to have held such a view.

What is true of this doctrine of future punishment, might be shown to be true of practically every great doctrine of Christianity, in the history of the early Church. The various Scriptural tenets of Christendom were first given form or expression when they were assailed or repudiated. The great fundamentals of the faith had been the common property of the Church from the days of the apostles. They were at first tacitly accepted and believed without any creedal form or statement. But when they were assailed by false teachers and perverters of the truth, then great men arose in their defense; and, by an accumulation of proofs from the Scriptures, which they marshalled with a logic that was inexorable, they once for all established such tenets and removed them from the field of further controversy. Thus, after having been the almost unconscious possession of the universal Church from the days of the apostles, by the very necessity occasioned by these attacks upon the truth tenet after tenet of the faith was made to rise out of the Scriptures in an embodied or creedal form, to remain thenceforth the permanent *conscious* possession of universal Christendom. This was true of the doctrines of the incarnation, the deity of Christ, the Trinity, etc., and perhaps only less apparently so of

that of *future punishment.* Indeed, it did not require a General Council to settle once for all this doctrine of endless punishment, as was the case with some other doctrines. It would therefore seem that it was more generally accepted than were those other doctrines and that the attacks upon this doctrine came chiefly from a *local* source; namely, from the Alexandrian School, as it came from Clement, Origen, and partly from the two Gregories. In further illustration of our statement, we could call attention to the historic development of the oecumenical creeds, and especially to that of the Apostles' Creed, whose completed form is the result of a growth during about four centuries of conflict between truth and error (Jacobs: *Book of Concord,* Vol. II, pp. 16-19). Every phrase of this creed marks an epoch in the confirmation, and conscious bodying forth into tangible form, of truths that had tacitly, yea almost unconsciously, been held since the days of the apostles as the unmistakable teachings of Christ and His blessed apostles.

Thus these quotations on future punishment from Tertullian and others of the early Church, by those who would defend the doctrine of Universalism, instead of proving that the doctrine of universal salvation had thitherto been the accepted belief of the Church, prove the very opposite. They show that the endlessness of future punishment was so universally accepted as the teaching of the New Testament that it had not thitherto been attacked with sufficient force to necessitate a reply. But at last even this tacitly accepted doctrine was boldly challenged, and consequently a defense had to be forthcoming; and that defense was more or less often and forcibly reiterated from time to time till all opposition had again apparently ceased. It then re-

mained a part of that glorious heritage of the early Church to which belong the great oecumenical symbols, or as single tenets of faith the doctrines of the incarnation, the vicarious sacrifice of the Saviour, the deity of Christ and the glorious Trinity. Indeed, there is probably no truth or its statement that was not at some time challenged or denied in the ancient Church, and that, by the very strange law of the repeating of history, is not also by some denied in this golden age of scientific progress. And from this general rule such doctrines as those of the vicarious sacrifice and the atonement are not exempt also in our day. And, of course, the doctrine of the endlessness of future punishment must not be expected to escape.

During the middle ages the doctrine of future punishment was so universally accepted as hardly to call forth any significant objection to it. This is so well known as to make it unnecessary for us to present any arguments in proof of this fact. Indeed, this is even acknowledged by the exponents of Universalism. And it is surely not necessary for us to prove that the Reformers of the sixteenth century in their fresh and searching study of the Word of God undeniably understood it to teach the doctrine of future punishment. And that was an age of searching the Scriptures and its deeper meaning such as the world had not seen before. Nor has it seen its equal since. And this teaching of the Reformers has been the accepted doctrine of Protestantism ever since. Nor has unremitted study of the Word on the part of the host of trained and scholarly Protestant investigators from that day to this in the least altered this tenet of the faith; but it has rather the more firmly established it. But a few so-called advanced thinkers who have pretended

to be wise above what is written and above the unmistakable results of the combined researches of Christian scholarship, have arisen and have become the founders or leaders of sects that have not only deviated from the truth on this doctrine, but also on many related doctrines.

Thus throughout the centuries of Christian history the Scriptures have almost universally been understood to teach on this subject what is its very *evident* meaning; namely, future punishment for the wicked without the possibility of salvation. Belief in future punishment for the wicked has always been associated with belief in future blessedness for the righteous; and the one has been as fully established an article of faith as has been the other.

If all would be saved—and we speak with reverence—the Bible would either be untrue, or it would be the most misleading or deceptive book ever written. And what would the inference have to be as to Christ and His apostles and their ultimate motives? The Bible has almost universally been *understood* to teach a future punishment, and one that is endless. If this is what it is meant to teach, and if it were not so, then the Bible would manifestly be untrue or untruthful. And if its declarations are not meant to teach that—that is, if the teachings of Universalism were true—then, with but few exceptions, the whole Christian Church in all these centuries would have been deceived or misled by it. Even a civil document or a statute law, if it thus led to a misunderstanding of its contents, would be summarily repealed or changed so as to be sufficiently perspicuous to be correctly understood. Not so did Christ change the universally accepted teaching in the Old Testament about future

punishment. This conclusively proves that the accepted interpretation was correct, as is, of course, very clearly shown in His emphatic restatement of its teaching as popularly understood.

It would thus be apparent that if Universalism were true, Christ and the Scriptures would have to be regarded as false. But, God forbid! Universalism must necessarily be rejected as erroneous by all who acknowledge Christ and His Holy Word. The manifest inference, of course, is that the very evident teaching of the whole Bible, which the Christian world has always accepted, is correct and true. There is thus a future punishment, and one from which there is no salvation, for the wicked, for those who wilfully reject God's proffered grace in the atoning sacrifice of the eternal Son.

V UNIVERSALISM FURTHER DISPROVED BY ITS GROUNDLESSNESS AND INHERENT WEAKNESSES

We have now met the *arguments* for Universalism that have been advanced by its exponents and sympathizers in defense of universal salvation. In doing so we believe that we have already shown the theory to be untenable as an article of faith. And having shown the arguments in proof of this theory to have no validity, further discussion in defense of the actual teachings of the Scriptures upon this subject would seem to be unnecessary. In the absence of proof to the contrary, the generally accepted teaching of God's Word must stand. But in order still further to show the untenableness of Universalism, and perhaps to offset other objections against the belief of the evangelical Churches on this subject, we shall here add some

further points of a more *direct* and *positive* nature in proof of this generally accepted article of faith.

1 UNIVERSALISM IN CONFLICT WITH BOTH CONSCIOUSNESS AND SCRIPTURE

The theory of universal salvation is in conflict with the universal consciousness of the race. The heart of man everywhere instinctively feels that future, and indeed eternal, punishment is a terrible reality. His conscience makes him cry in agony for a means of escape from its terrors. Where man is in ignorance of the true means of escape through the great divine Sacrifice, he invents sacrifices of his own to ease his conscience and to appease what his own darkened understanding bodies forth as God. As by an inborn impelling need of light and salvation from impending doom, he would fain lift his heart to God and light and salvation and peace.

This universal instinct of the human heart is amply confirmed or corroborated in the multiplied explicit teachings of Scripture concerning the reality of both a place and a state of punishment in the future world, as has been clearly shown. It is also confirmed by implication even in God's promises in the Bible. These are always associated with specified conditions, disregarding which means rejection by that same merciful, but equally just, God, and certain punishment. This fact is even implied in such sayings of the Saviour as the beatitudes. Thus in the first beatitude (Matt. 5:3) it is clearly implied that those who are not poor in spirit are not blessed, for theirs is not the kingdom of heaven, as is also explicitly stated in Matthew 18:3. So those that are pure in heart shall not see God (Matt. 5:8), as is also elsewhere taught directly. Thus all the

rich promises of the Gospel are stated with unmistakable conditions.

The very greatness and richness of God's promises make it all the greater sin to reject them; and therefore they all the more imply a just punishment. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says: "A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Heb. 10:28-31). The same truth is also very emphatically expressed by Christ, as follows: "I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city," etc. (Luke 10:12-15). See also parallel passages, and Luke 11:31-32.

2 CONCESSIONS OF ITS EXPONENTS

It has been seen that the arguments for Universalism which we have reviewed were based chiefly upon philosophic or supposedly ethical and historic premises, while the Scriptures were appealed to only in a general way in vindication of the contentions. But no attempt is made by the defenders of this theory to develop it directly from the Bible, and from the Bible alone. Indeed, that universal salvation is not *directly* taught in the Bible must be admitted even by every honest exponent of that theory. And this is reluctantly acknowledged by many a fair-minded writer on the

subject. Thus Thomas Starr King, in his answer to Nehemiah Adams (1858) on the *Reasonableness of Future Punishment,* makes the following admission: "I freely say that I do not find the doctrine of the ultimate salvation of all souls clearly stated in any text, or in any discourse, that has been reported from the lips of Christ. I do not think we can fairly maintain that the final restoration of all men is a prominent and explicit doctrine of the four Gospels. We needlessly narrow the grounds of opposition to sacrificial Orthodoxy, by attacking it from such a position" *(Eternal Punishment,* p. 5). He says further, "There is no argument for the final triumph of goodness recorded in the four Gospels, nor any dogmatic textual assertion of that doctrine; but all the principles glow there" *(Ibid.,* p. 7). And again, "Christ has given us cardinal truths of a great religion to be worked out by ourselves into intellectual results. Whatever results those principles lead to, are just as much parts of Christianity as if he had covered pages of sacred parchment in writing them for us" *(Ibid.,* p. 8). Once more, "We are sure that God made our reason and our hearts. We cannot be so sure that he is the author of the Bible, so that, if we find insoluble discord between the two, there can be little question which must and ought to yield" *(Ibid.,* p. 11).

Thus it will be seen how otherwise well-meaning men are led by the very logic of their own reasoning, from erroneous assumed premises or half truths, to deny the finality of the declarations of inspired prophets and apostles and thus to reject them as the court of final appeal. Dr. Marion D. Shutter is driven by such logic to assert, "I do not assume that the Bible from beginning to end is an absolutely infallible book

—that every statement is to pass unchallenged" (*Justice and Mercy*, p. 62). And, as it were, to weaken the irresistible force of the language of Scripture as to the endlessness of future punishment—to take the possible sting out of such threatened punishment—Dr. Shutter would even read out of Scripture its primary purpose. This he does in the following words: "I may say right here that the Bible deals less with the future than we commonly suppose. Its aim is not to map out the soul's condition hereafter; but to regenerate and purify and build up into righteousness the soul of man on this side of the horizon" (*Ibid.*, p. 66). It is indeed true that one aim of the Bible is "to regenerate and build up into righteousness the soul of man on this side of the horizon," but only in view or for the purpose of its endless existence on the other side of that horizon. And to this end, enough of the great realities there are revealed to serve as light for our footsteps on the journey thither.

Another writer is, by the same fallacious reasoning, led to make the following statement: "If the Bible teaches 'everlasting punishment,' so much the worse for the Bible, because we cannot believe it; you may quote texts and have behind the texts the very finest scholarship to justify certain interpretations, but it is no good. We are no longer the slaves of a book, nor the blind devotees of a creed; we believe in love and in evolution. The 'Origin of Species' knocked the bottom out of many creeds, and particularly it made the belief in the orthodox hell absolutely impossible." (A. J. Waldron, in *Is There a Hell*, p. 31). And yet this same writer makes the following confession: "Of course there is a hell. I could not believe in God unless I believed in justice, and outraged conscience de-

mands that the sinner should be punished. How I know not, but I believe the verdict and sentence will be just, and that in the end we shall 'rise on stepping stones of our dead selves to higher things' " *(Ibid.,* p. 34). The presumptuous absurdity of this writer's first statement is so manifest as hardly to require an answer. The old tried and true Book of God is dethroned and "cast as rubbish to the void," and Darwin's *Origin of Species,* with its now well-nigh exploded and scientifically outgrown form of the theory of evolution, is enthroned. Dr. Waldron has apparently become the slave of an erroneous book of mere human origin and the blind devotee of its creed of dust. And yet his own instinct of justice cannot thus be suppressed. It is bodied forth in words in the second quotation, where he speaks of a hell, although it be a hell patterned after evolution and at last to be crowned with the outworkings of that theory.

Thus the theory of Universalism cannot stand the honest examination of really able Universalists themselves. They must concede that this theory of a universal salvation is not taught in the Scriptures, and that even human instinct, conscience and reason, are arrayed against it. We shall therefore leave this point with its own unmistakable lesson and proceed to consider the *moral dangers involved.*

3 MORAL DANGERS INVOLVED IN THE THEORY

The moral effects of prospective universal salvation, upon man as a free moral agent in this world, would not be difficult to imagine. If all would be saved, and especially if so by some fixed or absolute law of necessity, or by the omnipotence or prevailing power of God, then surely there would be no need of prayer,

Church, Gospel, preacher, nor even of Christ and His atoning death. The words of the Quaker layman to the preacher candidate who denied the existence of future punishment and hell, would in this connection be full of meaning. He said, "if thee has said truly that there be no hell and no future punishment, we do not need thee, And if thee has said falsely that there be no hell and no future punishment, then we do not want thee." Indeed, if hell and future punishment were not a reality, then "to be or not to be" would no longer be a question. Then, even for the suicide to die would truly be gain. If that were so,

"Who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
The pangs of disprized love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes,
When he himself might his quietus make
With a bare bodkin?"

(Shakespeare: *Hamlet*, Act III, Scene I).

But God forbid that any such unwarranted meaning should be read into His Word against its own emphatic and repeated protests, as to justify the terrible sin of conscious suicide!

It might also be said that if the teaching of ultra Universalism were true, then its adherents would surely merit no greater bliss hereafter. But if its teachings are false, as is only too evident from both nature and Scripture, then its adherents are taking chances of losing all and being lost. Moreover, if all would be saved, the unbeliever's destiny would be the same as that of the believer; and that of the brutal murderer would be the same as that of his innocent

victim, however pure and noble that victim might be. It is hardly necessary to state what effect such a moral order—or rather immoral or unmoral disorder—and its acceptance by faith, would have upon such a real world as ours, already only too full of wickedness. What moral restraint or fear would such an order, and faith in the same, afford to curb the evil propensities of the unregenerate natural man? What moral fruits can a religion produce that denies the natural sinfulness of man, his real need of a Saviour, the divinity of Christ, the doctrine of the atonement, and even in a sense the moral agency of man?

Imagine the apostles going forth with such a creed of negations to convert the world! Imagine them saying: "Repent and flee from a wrath that will not come! Be baptized unto your brother man Jesus, the son of Mary and Joseph! Believe on him who died not for your sins but as an example of mere self-sacrifice! Live noble and righteous lives, although whether you do so or not, you will nevertheless all be saved! Forsake your idols and turn to God, although He will not hold it against you and punish you for idolatry! Believe whatever you will as to all these things, and He will save you anyhow!"

What an emasculated religion that would be! It would be exactly what many with itching ears (2 Cor. 4:3-4) in our day are only too glad to welcome and help to propagate. It meets their wishes: and rather generally it matches the lives of such as give it their enthusiastic endorsement. But it is not a religion for apostles and missionaries and preachers of the truth to proclaim, with much hope of converting the world or of making it morally better. Such a religion can arouse the consciences of but few people and really

change the hearts of perhaps none. It can foster little devotion and send few to the Bible in search of salvation and eternal life. If searching in Scripture is done in the name of such a religion it is generally done to bolster up that religion which is so soothing to a sleeping conscience, against the real searchers after truth. Universalism may seem beautiful as a theory for a social, literary or philosophic club, or for a self-constituted society of men and women for mutual entertainment; but as a religion for the sin-sick and salvation-hungry soul it is unsatisfying because it is neither regenerative nor morally unlifting. As Universalism teaches that all men will ultimately be saved, and therefore redemption to it is needless, it may be called redemptionless. And as it is redemptionless, it is crossless. And as it is crossless, it is Christless. Then why call it Christian? That many succeed in living outwardly moral lives, only shows what some may be in spite of their faulty faith. However, the apparent outward morality is by no means a safe criterion by which to measure the inner spiritual relationship to God. At any rate, such is not the rule, but rather the notable exception in demonstration of the rule.

That the number of adherents of Universalism, either professed or secret, is apparently growing fast in this age of shifting faiths, is a patent fact well known to the religious world. And that a good part of the people of the nominally Christian world do indeed so live as if salvation must be the necessary inheritance of all as a matter of course, is so evident to every observer as to need no proof. But these afford no evidence or argument for universal salvation. They are only an incident of what is only too sadly

the case in many sects and circles; namely, an unmistakable drifting away from the unchanging truths and stern realities of the redemptive Christianity of Christ and Paul, to the spineless, crossless, Christless culturism of modern pharisaic self-righteousness and moral or spiritual evolutionism of this outwardly cultured twentieth century.

The arch-enemy of man said to that sinless, innocent pair in Eden, who were forbidden by their Maker under penalty of death to eat of that mysterious tree of the knowledge of good and evil, "Ye shall not surely die" (Gen. 3:4). So it has always been Satan's method to soothe the fears, and rock to sleep the consciences, of those who will give him audience, by contradicting God's declarations concerning the penalties with which He will surely visit the transgressions of His holy laws—laws which are otherwise, however, the very expression of His love. This seems to be the very end and aim of Satan in prompting and fostering much of false philosophy or erroneous faith. Beware of any teachings that are in conflict with God's revealed truth in explicit declarations, and especially if such conflicting teachings would nullify God's justice and carry the sinner to the skies on "flowery beds of ease." As such cannot be from God, they must necessarily have their subtle source in man's determined foe, Satan the prince of the powers of darkness.

We must not look for Satan in the form in which the artist has pictured him; namely, as a terrifying being with hoofs and horns. He did not thus approach even mother Eve, but appeared under the guise of a creature "more subtle than any beast of the field" (Gen. 3:1). His words were honeyed words of pretended kindness to the unsuspecting mother of man-

kind. He even thus made an attempt to bring under his subtle power the Son of God incarnate. He tempted Him in His hunger with bread of His own creation. He tempted Him with reckless presumption upon God the Father's protection, for which he even brazenly quoted from the 91st. Psalm. He tempted Him with the kingdoms of the world and all their glory (Matt. 4:1-11). And, surely, no less so does he operate in this refined and gilt-edged cultured twentieth century. He can command a far easier audience by approaching as an angel of light than as a demon of darkness. And he still skillfully uses such honeyed words as "Ye shall not surely die," though it be only through the medium of suggestion within the unregenerate heart. He thus, through all the otherwise perhaps legitimate pleasures of sense, approaches those whom he would destroy, begging fuller and fuller indulgence and satiety, assuring them, "Ye shall not surely die." Who has not seen this illustrated many times in the lives of drunkards or devotees of licentiousness?

Thus very skillful and subtle indeed is Satan's use of counterfeit religions and religious counterfeits. Who does not know how he uses subtle religious cults to draw men away from the central truth of Christ's blood-atonement? Study the various cults of our time —Spiritualism, so-called Christian Science, and the rest of them—and see whether their central theme is not an evasion of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, away from which as by mystic force these cults seem to draw their thousands of victims. And the last-named of these cults in its name presumes to be so perfect an imitation of real Christianity that it calls itself by the two precious words *Christian Science*, the one

the noblest term in the realm of religion and the other in that of thought and investigation. And as its basic principle, it also rests upon Satan's own suggestion, "Thou shalt not surely die," with its associated errors of "No sickness, no evil, no sin, no damnation, no punishment; but all good, all blessedness." It surely is well to be on one's guard against any religion or religious doctrine that nullifies the atonement, sets aside God's justice, and teaches a universal redemption regardless of God's own conditions.

It may be added here that the very arguments of Universalists that are urged against future punishment would have equal force, if force they have at all, against future blessedness. If there were no future punishment, then by the same reasoning it might be shown that there would be no future blessedness. To contend, moreover, that the former is of short duration while the latter is without end, is simply a contention, as the terminology for their duration is the same for both. Therefore, if future punishment were but of short duration, future happiness would be of but short duration. But if future blessedness is of endless duration, as we shall show it to be, under *Eternalism,* then future punishment must of necessity also be of endless duration. So the argument against *hell* from the primary meaning of the word, would have equal weight against heaven from the primary meaning of the word *heaven.* Therefore, by these very arguments of Universalists their theory is seen to be utterly groundless.

4 ITS FUNDAMENTAL FALLACIES

As a theory Universalism is indeed beautiful, but it bears the earmarks of the poet and the philosopher

rather than those of the theologian and the devout Christian. In harmony with it are the following otherwise beautiful words of Tennyson:

"Oh! yet we trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill,
To pangs of nature, sins of will,
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood;

That nothing walks with aimless feet;
That not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete.

.....

Behold, we know not anything;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all."
(In Memoriam)

As poetry or philosophy, the theory of Universalism might be said to be attractive; but as doctrine or theology founded upon the revealed Word of God, it cannot stand. It is clearly based upon sentiment rather than upon fact, upon human wish rather than upon divine truth. Its fundamental postulate—that God is love—is indeed true; but to say that therefore all will be saved, does not follow, for God is also infinitely just. His infinite love of good even implies infinite hatred of evil. And this the Scriptures very explicitly teach. That many are lost beyond the possibility of salvation and consigned to endless punishment, is repeatedly taught in Scripture, as we shall show under *Eternalism*. If it were true that man is not by nature a sinner, and therefore not a fallen but

a developing being, and if at death each soul entered the future world to continue its upward progress toward God only as it leaves this, then all men might be supposed finally to be saved, and even by their own efforts. But what says God's Word? We need not multiply passages here, as this has been shown elsewhere, except for the sake of completeness to refer the reader to such as Genesis 3; Job 25:4; Psalm 51:5; Romans 3:9; Galatians 3:22; Luke 16:19-31; Matthew 25-31-46; etc. In these and many other passages, and by implication generally, Scripture teaches that man is a fallen and sinful, not an unfolding, being, as also our own consciences, experience and human history clearly testify. And the Bible no less clearly declares that it required the death of even the only begotten Son of God to make salvation possible for man, and that all who reject, or do not believe in, Him are lost.

Indeed, not only are the primary suppositions of Universalism contrary to Scripture and false, but as a logical result the whole system is permeated with error. In it, truth is so bound up with error as to make it almost unrecognizable, while error by its very association with truth is often mistaken for truth by the uninitiated. Thus, in acknowledging a resurrection, Universalism *seems* to follow the Bible, but its conception of the resurrection as a mere transition from this sphere of existence to a future sphere, clearly nullifies every element of the resurrection as taught by Christ and His apostles. So its conception of Christ's divinity, as defined by some of its apologists to make it appear more palatable, may seem to be Scriptural, but in reality it is essentially *Unitarian.* And, indeed, what would become of the incarnation and the atonement, as well as of many related doc-

trines, if the theory of Universalism were true? These great doctrines of Scripture have, and can have, no place in Universalism. Its very fundamental viewpoint is evolutionary rather than redemptive. Thus, as has been shown, Universalism's denial of future endless punishment is naturally, almost necessarily, followed by a denial of the deity of Christ, of the atonement, of man's native depravity, and of the reality of sin, hell and Satan, and consequently of the inspiration and infallibility of the Word of God, in which these doctrines are taught. And from these denials it is but a short step to the denial of the resurrection, future blessedness, immortality, heaven, angels and even the personality of God. Universalism thus opens the floodgates to final infidelity or utter atheism. Its natural fruits of licentiousness and sin must therefore be apparent to him who will follow such principles in their application to real life.

Such, then, is the doctrine of Universalism with its possible fruits. Who would be willing to risk embarking upon even an earthly journey in a vessel that was exposed to so many risks, and against the safety of which almost everybody and every circumstance were unitedly testifying! And yet there are many who thus rashly embark on their journey from this world to that unknown future realm in the conscience-soothing vessel of Universalism, when all the testimony of nature, conscience and revelation are against its safety. No one should risk to accept and follow such man-made theories as a cure-all from future ills. Jesus the Christ alone must be accepted as Saviour and Lord. He will not suffer one who trusts in Him to perish; but He will save all who draw near to Him with the devout prayer upon their lips, "God, be thou merciful to me a sinner" (Luke 18:13).

CHAPTER VII

ETERNALISM

WILL FUTURE PUNISHMENT BE ENDLESS?

Although the eternity of future punishment has been alluded to or implied in the foregoing chapters, especially under *Annihilationism,* it is necessary to develop this part of our subject more fully.

I PHENOMENAL NATURE OF LANGUAGE CONSIDERED

Inasmuch as the objections to this doctrine are to a large extent based upon the terms used in the Bible to express it, it is well carefully to consider this point.

All human language, as has already been briefly stated in our first chapter, is phenomenal or metaphorical. Language is the outgrowth of necessity, terms being born or created whenever new ideas demand expression, or old terms being pressed into service with added meanings. From primary or root ideas, reason, recognizing certain relations, comparisons, etc., evolves more complex but related ideas. Yet all these ideas may be said to have their ultimate root in the physical sensorium. Therefore, through sense experience and consciousness, acted upon by reason, all language is really the outgrowth of, as it is based upon, the present physical sphere with its needs. Ideas like those of *infinity* and *eternity,* extending or lying beyond the range of human consciousness and

experience, have therefore no *primary* or *root* terms in human speech. This inadequacy of language directly to express such ideas is necessarily manifest also in the Bible. This is particularly true of such transcendental ideas as those of *creation ex nihilo,* the facts of the *spiritual world,* and especially that of *God.* Note the name *I AM,* etc. (Ex. 3:14); or the Hebrew names *Jehovah, El, Elohim, Elah, Eloah, et al.* These names, as their etymology shows, illustrate this inadequacy of human speech to express the idea of God. The same is likewise true of the many so-called anthropomorphisms of Scripture.

The inspired writers, addressing human hearers and readers, always used human language as they found it. But by new relations and in new connections, as well as by repetitions or reduplications and by pluralizations, they gave expression to ideas ordinarily lying beyond the range of consciousness and experience, and therefore transcending unenlightened human understanding. Thus the ordinary Hebrew word *olam* (period of time), in its modified forms *le olam, olam, olamim,* etc., was made to express the transcendental idea of *eternity, for ever and ever.* So *aion* (adj. *aionios*) is primarily, indeed, a temporal term expressing *duration;* but, even apart from its modified forms, it often very plainly has a timeless meaning. When it is used of this world or of man's life in this world, it of course is limited to this world's or life's duration and is therefore necessarily used in a temporal sense. As examples, we may cite cases where *houtos ho (this)* is used with *aion (world* or *age),* as in Matthew 12:32; Luke 16:8; 20:34; Romans 12:2; or where *ho nun (the now* or *this)* is used with it, as in 1 Timothy 6:17; 2 Timothy 4:10; Titus 2:12. See

also Mark 3:29; Galatians 1:4. When, however, this word *aion* is used of the future world and of future life, its content or duration corresponds to that world and that life; and *they* are acknowledged by all to be *endless.* Thus in the expression "neither in this world [*aioni*], nor in that [*aioni,* understood] which is to come" (Matt. 12:32), the first word *aioni* very manifestly is used in a temporal sense, as of that which has an end, and especially as to the possibility of forgiveness. But the second word *aioni* (understood), is used in a timeless sense, as of that which does not have an end. And what is true of the use of the word *aion,* in these two senses in Matthew 12:32, is equally true of its use in Ephesians 1:21, where Christ is spoken of as being made to sit "far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world [*aioni*], but also in that [*aioni,* understood] which is to come."

Thus *aion* is used of eternity just as truly as it is used of time. And that is its evident meaning whenever it is used, whether as a noun or in its form of an adjective, of the *future world,* of *future life* and of *God.* And when used of future, or the second or eternal, death, or of future punishment, it is as unlimited in its duration as when it is used of the future life and future blessedness. Indeed, its duration is determined by the world or age for, or in connection with, which it is used. Thus when used of God, angels, future world, future life, future punishment, *aion* clearly involves the idea of endlessness. To deny this is to deny that the existence of God has no end. It will be interesting to note that of the sixty-six times that *aionios* is used in the New Testament, in two places it is used of God (Rom. 16:26; Heb. 9:14), in

fifty-one places it is used of future happiness, in seven places it is used of future punishment (Matt. 18:8; 25:41; 25:46; Mark 3:29; 2 Thess. 1:9; Heb. 6:2; Jude 7). In the other six places it is used of what is endless, in at least five places. The same is true of *aion.* In Matthew 25:41, everlasting (*aionion*) fire for condemned men is said to be the same as that for lost angels; therefore it must be everlasting. Nor does the fact that *aion* is used rhetorically in the plural also for this world (1 Cor. 2:7; etc.) in the least affect our argument. Other points will be set forth under our next subdivision.

What is true as to modified forms of Hebrew and Greek time-words to express *timelessness,* is equally true of the Latin translation of these forms, such as *secula seculorum (for ever and ever),* from the ordinary *seculum (age).* Note also the German *von ewigkeit zu ewigkeit* and the English *for ever and ever.* The primary form of the Greek *aion* and *aionios* is *aei* or *aiei.* And this has been brought over into Latin in *aevum (age, eternity),* into English in *aye* and *ever,* etc. And, indeed, as is the case with Greek and Hebrew terms, so these terms in Latin and other languages, in their unmodified forms, are also used of that which is endless.

The idea of eternity is therefore an outgrowth of, and is expressed in terms primarily expressing, temporal ideas. So *endless, timeless, without end, all the time, always,* etc., are primarily or radically *temporal* terms. Thus *end* is a temporal term, but with its suffix *less* it acquires a timeless sense. Even the word *timeless* used in this explanation, is itself thus primarily a *temporal* term, so that even here we have an illustration of the fact referred to before,

namely, the inadequacy of human language directly to express such ideas as *eternity,* etc., because they lie beyond the range of human consciousness and experience and have therefore naturally no *primary* or *root* terms in human speech. But all these terms, as has been shown above, in their new forms or relations, none the less express ideas which we speak of as *eternal.* And all these various Scriptural terms or expressions, whether in the original or in translation, or even in theological literature, have been so understood by all except a few modern objectors, who would stand in judgment upon the counsels and decrees of the infinite and omniscient God as to the duration of the punishment of the wicked.

These men admit the timeless meaning of these same terms when used of the duration of God and of the blessedness of the saved. But by a strange inconsistency, when they are used, even in the same paragraph or sentence, of the damnation of the lost, they would read a temporal meaning into them. But their arguments, so far as they might otherwise have even any appearance of force, would be equally valid in an attempt to disprove the eternity of God and of the blessed; and therefore these arguments really prove nothing.

In order further to illustrate our point as to the meaning of these terms, we might speak of their use in the writings of heathen poets and philosophers to express the endless existence and deathlessness of the gods, etc.; but this would hardly be necessary for our purpose. It should be said, however, that though these primary time-words were first used in early literature for short time-periods, such as a thing's duration of existence, they gradually came to be used of eternal

duration, especially so in their modified forms, as noted above. And this last had become the accepted meaning at the time of our Lord. Therefore, such words in the New Testament must be accepted with their derived meaning, especially where the context also clearly demands it. Thus *aion,* with its various modifications and equivalents, is used in the Greek New Testament of what is translated "eternal God" (Rom. 16:26); "eternal punishment" (Matt. 25:46); "eternal life" (Matt. 25:46). And these uses are parallel—the last two occurring even in the same sentence—and must therefore be interpreted alike. The measure of the duration of the existence of God and of future life is therefore the measure of the duration of future punishment. To abbreviate future punishment is to abbreviate future happiness (eternal life). They either both will have an end or both will be endless. Therefore, to deny the endlessness of future punishment for the lost and yet admit eternity of blessedness for the saved, is an intellectual absurdity. No, as future happiness will be eternal, so also will future punishment be eternal.

II CURRENT JEWISH BELIEF AND THE TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE

That the eternity of future punishment is taught in the Old Testament is seen from such passages as Daniel 12:2, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting contempt." See also Isaiah 34: 10; 66:24; etc. Indeed, the eternity of future punishment is everywhere assumed as a fundamental fact or truth, and is plainly implied, in the many warnings

that recur so often throughout the whole Old Testament. And that future punishment is eternal, was accepted by the Jews as the inspired teaching of Moses and all the prophets. This was therefore also the almost universal Jewish belief during their long prophetless period preceding the advent of the Saviour, as well as during and immediately following that advent. And, moreover, the duration of the punishment of the wicked was always regarded as equal to that of the blessedness of the righteous, as is shown by the literature of that period. That the Jews believed in the eternity of future punishment shortly before and during the time of our Lord, is evident from many passages in the writings of the Rabbis of that time and from the Old Testament Apocrypha. Nor is the Apocryphal New Testament less clear on this point. As the Apocryphal New Testament is not generally accessible, we shall quote one passage in illustration, as follows: "But the way of darkness is crooked and full of cursing. For it is the way of eternal death, with punishment; in which they that walk meet those things that destroy their own souls" (Barnabas 15:1).

Moreover, for Christ not to interfere with the accepted interpretation of the Old Testament on this point, or with current Jewish belief, by properly modifying well-known and accepted terms and contradicting current teaching, is *prima facie* evidence that such had divine sanction and must therefore be received as in accord with divine revelation on this doctrine. And Christ certainly knew to what abuses His silence would lead in the future, and would therefore emphatically have expressed Himself to correct Jewish belief then current, if He did not mean to sanction it. But by not modifying the current interpretation of the Old Testa-

ment, He thus implicitly endorsed it; and this becomes all the more evident from such declarations as the following: "Think not that I came to destroy the law of the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. 5:17).

But Christ did not only not contradict the current Jewish belief and interpretation of the Old Testament, that future punishment will be eternal, but He also very *explicitly taught* that it will be so. He is very emphatic in His teaching upon this point, and solemnly and repeatedly warns against its dangers. Thus we may cite Mark 9:43, "And if thy hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands to go into hell [*Gehenna*], into the unquenchable fire." Equally emphatic are His words in Matthew 25:41-46, already quoted. In the last passage, the wicked are said to share the punishment of the fallen angels or the devil, and that all acknowledge to be without end. We surely need not multiply passages, as these should afford abundant proof that the Lord taught that the punishment of the wicked will be eternal.

Nor are the apostles, whose writings are meant to unfold the teaching and mind of the Lord, without their inspired testimony on this subject. And if the very manifest meaning of the Saviour's teachings, which was and has ever since been the accepted interpretation, were erroneous, then we should naturally look in the epistles for the necessary corrections. But instead of correcting the natural impression, that Christ taught that future punishment will be endless, this endlessness is everywhere taken for granted. The apostles assume it as a doctrine that needs no proof from them. St. Paul, who was so thoroughly acquainted

with the teaching of the Old Testament and its current Jewish interpretation and accepted belief, nowhere contradicts, nor even tries to correct, the manifest teaching that future punishment will be endless. On the contrary, he very solemnly asserts or reaffirms this doctrine in his epistles. Thus he declares, "Who [that know not God, etc.] shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might" (2 Thess. 1:9). In many other expressions he also very clearly implies it, while it is one of the elements that is fundamental to his whole theology and to his great missionary enterprise. See Romans 2:9; 2 Thessalonians 2:12; Philippians 3:18-19. Moreover, in the Book of Revelation this doctrine of the endlessness of future punishment is repeatedly emphasized, and without any apology or defense to satisfy the maudlin sentimentalists of that period. Let the reader turn to Revelation and see for himself how full of this cardinal doctrine of Christianity it is.

That the endlessness of future punishment is unmistakably taught in Scripture, and especially in the New Testament, is acknowledged even by every great infidel who has seen fit to direct his futile missiles against the Rock of Ages. These infidels seem at least consistent as to this matter. Finding the doctrine of endless punishment, among other things to which they object, very explicitly taught in Scripture, they do not attempt to force these statements of Scripture into the mould of their own vain preconceptions, but they reject the *records* that are so clearly in conflict with their own views. The rationalistic theologian and the maudlin sentimentalist, on the other hand, are guilty of absurdly attempting to force the teachings of the Bible into the mould of their own thinking, although these teach-

ings and their own opinions no more agree than does light with darkness, or truth with error, anywhere else. To contend, as does even Schliermacher, that the everlasting punishment for the wicked spoken of in such passages as Matthew 25:46 is merely a figure, is only to dodge the force of a plain matter-of-fact statement by throwing over it the mantle of a figure.

Thus the endlessness of future punishment was taught in the Old Testament, and this teaching was the current Jewish belief at the time of our Lord, while Christ Himself, as well as His apostles, repeatedly emphasized and more fully developed it. Nor could the terms have any other meaning. And to try to explain them otherwise than the Jews, and indeed that age generally, understood them, would in effect be attempting to make of the Saviour a wilful deceiver.

Moreover, that future punishment should be eternal is not at all contrary even to *reason.* As already intimated, as acts of good tend to permanence in character, so repeated acts of sin by an irresistible law of our very nature have a tendency to perpetuate themselves. A state of sinfulness may thus be developed here that will necessarily hereafter continue eternally. In wilfully resisting the proffered grace of God, whereby a change of character and salvation are possible, the heart at last becomes so hardened in this very resistance that conversion will no longer be possible. Thus sinfulness may become eternal by its very nature, and would therefore deserve eternal punishment. And this necessity of punishment for sin, as long as it continues, is admitted even by those who deny the endlessness of punishment considered by itself. Thus, while they would deny our conclusion as to the endlessness of future punishment, they must necessarily admit our pre-

mises. And, in logical consistency, it would seem that they must necessarily also accept our conclusion; namely, *that future punishment is endless.*

Even Canon Farrar, in his Preface to *Eternal Hope,* recognizes this great law of persistence in evil and its consequent punishment. He concedes the power of the human will to resist the law, and finally reject the love, of God. He says: "I have never denied—nay, in spite of deep and yearning hope, I have expressly admitted —the possibility of even endless misery for those who abide in the determined impenitence of final and willing sin" (*Preface to Ninth Thousand,* p. xiii). Again, "I have steadily and earnestly maintained that no human soul can be saved whether in this world or the next, without repentance; or admitted into blessedness whether here or hereafter, while its sinful state remains; or delivered from eternal death by *any* means, save such as are derived from the efficacy of Christ's redemption" (*Ibid.,* p. xiv). And in another place he says: "My hope is that the vast majority, at any rate, of the lost, may at length be *found.* If any hardened sinner, shamefully loving his sin, and despising the long-suffering of his Saviour, trifle with that doctrine, it is at his own just and awful peril" (*Eternal Hope,* p. 88). And as to conditional immortality his words are very positive: "I cannot accept the spreading doctrine of Conditional Immortality; I cannot preach the certainty of Universalism" (*Ibid.,* p. 84). And once more: "And if you ask me whether I must not believe in endless torments for these reprobates of earth, my own answer is, Ay, for these and for thee, and for me too unless we learn with all our hearts to love good and not evil" (*Ibid.,* p. 104). And all this from one who is often quoted as a defender of the theory of a possible

future salvation, against the doctrine of endless punishment! If Farrar is a strong defender of that theory and a leader of others, then what may we expect of those who are led? His arguments and concessions should show the reader how weak are the arguments of these men in general and how untenable is their position. Even Dr. Shutter, a staunch Universalist, holds that punishment will follow sin; that it extends, if necessary, even into the next world; and that it lasts as long as sin lasts (*Justice and Mercy,* p. 77). This is in line with what is stated above and may be considered as one of the premises in our reasoning. Punishment lasts as long as sin lasts. Sin in some cases lasts forever. Therefore, punishment, in those cases, must last forever.

III OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

A The argument has been advanced that in speaking about *eternal* or aeonian (*aionios*) life, Christ and His apostles meant quality rather than duration, and that this was true also of *eternal death.* Some hold that by eternal life is meant *essential* life and that eternal death is merely the want of this essential life, but that in neither case has the word *eternal* any reference to time. It is indeed true that eternal life is essential life and eternal death its opposite, but that is not the whole truth. Both this essential life and its opposite death are declared to be eternal in *duration.*

Among the passages of Scripture upon which this contention is based is Christ's declaration in John 3:36, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life." Another passage is John's statement in 1 John 5:13, "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life." The contention is that

these sayings, being in the present tense, could not be true of an eternal life in the sense of duration, even as they could not refer to one in the future. It is indeed true that there is a sense in which God's children do have eternal life in this world. But the fact seems to be overlooked that it is not exhausted, but has only its beginning, here, and that in its higher reality it must continue hereafter forever. And what is true of eternal life, in the relation of the *here* to the *yonder,* is also true of eternal death; for spiritual death here is the beginning of eternal death in its more terrible issue hereafter. Indeed, as eternity is an ever present *now,* it may be said, in a sense, to have no future nor any past. And, therefore, any punishment in the eternal world which may be conceived of from these temporal shores as imposed by God at any time, is equally conceivable as continuing for all time, or as there *continually present.* But this objection has so little weight that it does not require further consideration. Thus *aion* and *aionios* are nowhere used in Scripture to express mere quality, but wherever used they express *duration.*

B The objection is made that such endless punishment would not only be in conflict with God's infinite mercy, but also in plain contradiction even of his equally infinite justice; and that, therefore, it would involve these two attributes of God in inexplicable mystery. But as an answer to this objection has already practically been included in our sixth chapter, we do not feel it necessary to repeat the same, or to add more, here. However, as to the statement that an endless future punishment would involve God's attributes in inexplicable mystery, it is enough here to say that this is only an attempt to shift a mystery, which unaided

human reason must necessarily acknowledge as existing somewhere. This mystery is not so much in God's attributes, although these are mysterious, nor even in the endlessness of punishment; but it is rather in the existence or reality of *sin* that makes such punishment necessary. And even sin itself we have shown under *Probationism* and *Universalism* to be eternal; therefore, the punishment must also be eternal.

C Another objection is based upon the possible number of those who would thus be eternally lost. But as to this little need be said. The number of the saved will indeed probably be greater than is generally believed. This is implied in various passages in the book of Revelation, as well as elsewhere. This would also seem quite natural from the fact that many die in innocent infancy, that apparently many are saved as by fire even at the last moment (like the penitent thief), and that there may be circumstances operating for the salvation of many that do not become apparent to us in this life. But the Saviour's words in Matthew 7:13-14 and Luke 13:23-24 should be a sufficiently plain warning to any who, in objecting to eternal punishment, would attempt too radical a reduction of the number of the lost. At any rate, the mystery in which the endlessness of future punishment is involved is brought no nearer to a solution by supposing the number of the lost to be reduced even well nigh to the vanishing point. The objector might as well, therefore, make up his mind to accept the teaching of the Scriptures upon their face value as to the endlessness of future punishment, regardless of the number of those who are thus ultimately lost.

D The further objection is made that the very hap-

piness of the blessed would be marred if some of their fellowmen would be eternally lost. Upon this point the philosophic Schliermacher puts considerable emphasis. In his well known *Christlichen Glaube* he presents quite a lengthy argument against eternal punishment based upon this point (Vol. II., pp. 503ff.). However, as our answer to this objection in which we have shown its fallacy and consequent invalidity, has already been given under *Universalism,* we shall not further discuss this point here.

E Some contend, as already noted under *Annihilationism,* that while eternal life consists in eternal existence, eternal death consists in eternal non-existence, and that such eternal non-existence constitutes the punishment of the wicked. Some hold to a modified form of this theory; namely, that the incorrigibly wicked will be punished with the extinction of self-consciousness. This was a favorite theory of Rothe.

From the viewpoint of many a hardened sinner, such annihilation, or extinction of consciousness, would indeed be a "consummation devoutly to be wished." But such non-existence is even unthinkable on the part of a normal mind. Try it. See whether you can conceive of yourself (or even of another) as not existing. On the contrary, man instinctively feels not only that death physical, but also that the "second death," does not end all. Thus, in his famous soliloquy, Hamlet is represented as reasoning out whether, in his condition, it were better "to be or not to be," with the conclusion, which even the natural man feels in the inner recesses of his own soul to be true; namely, that death is not life's end, and that it were therefore unwise to hasten it by one's own hand:

"Who would bear the whips and scorns of time,

. . . . . .

When he himself might his quietus make
With a bare bodkin? Who would fardels bear;—
But that the dread of something after death,
The undiscovered country from whose bourn
No traveler returns, puzzles the will,
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of?
Thus conscience does make cowards of us all."

(*Hamlet,* Act III, Scene I).

As the contention that eternal death consists in eternal non-existence has already been refuted under *Annihilationism,* it would be superfluous to enter into a lengthy discussion here. But for the sake of clearness, a summary of the argument or facts will be given.

The reasoning of these annihilationists is based upon false premises; therefore, their conclusions must be false. Their conception of death, both here and hereafter, is false. Death and destruction are not equivalent to annihilation, as we have shown. Thus a thing is destroyed when it is rendered unfit for the use for which it was intended. An automobile is said to be destroyed when, in a collision, it is ruined or rendered unfit for further use; but the accident by no means annihilates it. It still continues to exist, although as a vehicle that is broken and worthless. So in physical death, the body for a short time even retains its identity, but it can no longer perform its functions. And even in dissolution, in its elements it continues its being. And if the soul then is without God, it, too, is but a broken existence, without the exercise of the spiritual and religious functions which are essential to real

life, or life in God. And in eternal death, or what is called the "second death," the reunited soul and body are forever thus destined to exist. Thus we are told, "Who [that know not God, etc.] shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might" (2 Thess. 1:9). See also Mark 9:43-47; Revelation 14:11; 20:10.

Thus the souls of the unrighteous, no less than those of the righteous, will continue in conscious existence between death and the resurrection. Those will be in a state and place of misery, and these in a state and place of happiness. At the resurrection the bodies of both will rise and be reunited with their souls; and in body and soul, thus reunited, both will be judged. And then will they permanently be separated for continued conscious existence, the righteous going into the eternal heaven of fuller glory, and the unrighteous departing, as by their own moral gravitation, into the eternal hell *(Gehenna)* of deeper misery. Thus both the saved and the lost will have *eternal* being. The eternal being of the saved will be one of eternal *happiness.* It is that state of being in which man's God-given functions, then sanctified and untrammeled, can have their full normal exercise. It is called *life,* because it will be in full correspondence with its environment—in Him who is Life absolute and life's only source. It is "the life which is life indeed," and which alone is worthy of the name (Matt. 7:14; 18:8). The eternal being of the lost will be one of punishment and misery. It is a state of being in which man's God-given functions cannot have their exercise, or fulfill the end for which they were created. It will consist in separation from Him who is the Life, and therefore in non-correspondence with His glorious Being, etc., as its environment. It is the

opposite of life. It is, therefore, called *death,* because it will consist in the absence of what is above called *life,* and of its associated blessings.

Inasmuch as such is the certain doom of the lost, this doctrine of endless punishment is one that must not be lightly regarded by the objector, and especially not on sentimental grounds. In a sense, a man's destiny hereafter depends upon his attitude towards this doctrine in this life of probation. His life here is largely attuned to what he believes or knows will await him hereafter. In the words of Dr. Shedd: "Eternal perdition is like any other danger. In order to escape danger, one must believe in it. Disbelief of it is sure destruction. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. They who foresee an evil, prepare for it and avoid it; but 'the simple pass on and are punished.' Speaking generally, those who believe that there is a hell, and intelligently fear it, as they are commanded by Christ Himself, will escape it; and those who deny that there is a hell, and ridicule it, will fall into it" (*The Doctrine of Endless Punishment,* Preface, p. vi).

IV ETERNITY OF PUNISHMENT LOGICALLY NECESSITATED BY OTHER DOCTRINES

Many of the other cardinal doctrines of the Bible are so associated with that of the endlessness of the punishment of the wicked, that they either stand or fall with it. Therefore, to deny it is to deny them. Thus the doctrine of the atonement would be meaningless without this doctrine of eternal punishment. The infinite sacrifice of Christ would have been made for a very finite necessity, if eternal punishment were not a reality.

A *To minimize the greatness, or to shorten the du-*

ration, of future punishment, is to minimize the greatness of sin. This is exactly what is being done by those who deny the needlessness of future punishment. They not only attempt to minimize the greatness of sin, but they even, in the very face of Scripture, deny the fundamental doctrine of man's fall in Adam and original sin (Gen. 5:3; Ps. 51:5; John 3:5-6; Rom. 5:12-14; etc.). Thus Dr. Shutter, in somehow acknowledging the reality of sin, makes the following statement: "There is something real to be dreaded, and that is SIN. *Not the sin of Adam.* Let him take care of that; it does not concern you and me. Not *original or inherited depravity.* That is mere fiction. But that which is no fiction is one's own *personal wrong-doing*" (*Justice and Mercy,* p. 140). Another passage is equally emphatic: "Without consenting to that monstrous theological fiction, the fall of the race in Adam, whereby we are said to be under the curse of the law and deserving of endless fire, it is true that every one has to a greater or lesser extent, gotten away from the divine statutes, and needs to be brought back" (*Ibid.,* p. 228).

Thus these men do not regard human nature to be in ruins, as is everywhere either taught or implied in Scripture, and as is only too evident from human history, experience and observation, but they regard it as only incomplete. Even Ulric Zwingli was misled into the unscriptural position that sin is only a bad habit. And with this error other equally great errors were logically associated. To what greater errors this otherwise good man might have been misled if he had lived long enough to follow such fundamental misconceptions to all their logical conclusions! His fundamental principles have indeed been thus followed to their logi-

cal conclusions by some of his followers, and much of the unsettled rationalistic theology of our day is the sad result. Therefore, in so far at least, Ulric Zwingli unwittingly became what might be called the father of modern rationalism.

With this minimizing of the greatness of sin often is associated a very vague or erroneous conception of the Scriptural doctrine of the resurrection and the judgment, even in some cases to the utter denial of both. Thus Dr. Shutter says: "The idea of a future general judgment at the destruction of this world, where accounts shall be settled once for all and all at once, must share with the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice the responsibility of fostering carelessness and procrastination" (*Justice and Mercy,* p. 143). And after summing up the prevailing ideas of the resurrection and judgment, the same writer attempts to show how these ideas were gradually, at least in their practical application, abandoned, and then adds: "So with the vanishing of the notion of future judgment, the idea of a bodily resurrection has also been gradually fading. Perhaps the strong improbability,—even the absurdity,—of such a resurrection, did much to obliterate the belief of a future judgment" (*Ibid.,* p. 172). But surely the doctrine of the resurrection is so explicitly taught in Scripture, especially in the New Testament, that to deny it is virtually to deny the Bible (Job 19:26; Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2; John 5:28; 11:23-26; etc.). Indeed, the bodily resurrection of the Saviour lay at the foundation of the unbounded faith of the apostles and was made the unanswerable argument in their work of evangelization (Acts 24:15; Rom. 6:4-5; 2 Cor. 4:13-14; 1 Thess. 4:13-18; see also Matt. 28; Mark 16; Luke 24; John 20 and 21). And as to

the *judgment,* this doctrine is not only implied in the whole tenor of God's revelation to men, but it is also very explicitly taught in numerous passages of Scripture, such as Matthew 25:31-46; Acts 17:31; 2 Cor. 5:10; Heb. 9:27. But as this has already been considered under *Annihilationism,* we shall not further discuss it here.

We might add in this connection that, as sin is against the infinite God, there is a sense in which it must be considered infinite. A sin against a fellowman is great, but a sin against God is as much greater as God is greater than man, and is therefore infinite. Indeed, the sacrifice that was necessary to save man from sin and its guilt implies this; for it was not the sacrifice or death of a man, nor of an angel, but of the eternal Son of the infinite God. Hence, the atoning sacrifice of Christ *implies* what is explicitly taught in God's Word; namely, that those who reject Christ's pardoning grace will suffer punishment in the eternal world, and one that is endless. Even philosophically considered future endless punishment is thus further seen to be a reality.

B *To minimize the greatness of sin is to minimize, or even to deny, Christ's sacrifice for sin.* In true consistency, that is what these men either directly, or by implication, do. Thus Dr. Shutter says: "My hope is based, not upon immunity from suffering which the legerdamain of vicarious sacrifice offers, but largely upon the very fact of suffering itself. . . . Every man shall expiate his own sins" (*Justice and Mercy,* p. 143). Again he declares: "The atonement was not upon Calvary, but in the human heart. That was to be reconciled to a life or righteousness" (*Ibid.,* p. 161). In explaining 1 John 3:7, the same author makes the

following statement: "The righteous man, he who is justified in the sight of God, is the man who does right just as Christ did right; who stands before heaven and earth on the basis of his own character, just as Christ stands upon the basis of his character. Let no one lead you astray by teaching that there is any being in this universe who can take your place in obedience or in penalty. Every man stands for himself; there is no punishment but that which he himself suffers for his own transgressions. The penalty which ought to fall upon him is never laid upon the shoulders of another." (*Ibid.*, 225).

That the Scriptures teach that Christ died for man's sin, is so evident, and has always been so generally accepted, that it would seem that this could never be denied by any intelligent reader of the Word of God. And yet so blinded to the truth of God have some of these men become in endeavoring to establish their own favorite theories, that not only this but many other equally explicit teachings of the Bible have been denied by them. What an array of Scripture passages could be quoted in vindication of the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ! Very explicit and emphatic, indeed, are such passages as the following: "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" (John 1:29); "God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8); "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7). See also Isaiah 53:4-6; Matthew 20:28; John 10:18; Romans 8:32; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:13; 1 Timothy 2:6; 1 John 2:2; 4:10; as well as other passages on *imputation* and *justification*, notably Romans 1:17; 4:4-5; 8:1; 2 Corinthians 5:19; Philippians 3:9; etc. It is

surely not necessary, therefore, to develop this point any further. We would, however, refer the reader to *Purgationism,* division V, where the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement is set forth.

Moreover, with this minimizing or denying of Christ's sacrifice for sin is logically associated the minimizing of God's wrath upon sin, although this wrath is not only repeatedly emphasized in the Bible, but it is implied in all its many threatenings and promises. See especially Job 21:20; Psalm 106:23, 32; Romans 2:5, 8; Revelation 2:5. This very emphatic teaching of Scripture as to God's wrath upon sin is not only minimized, but even denied by Dr. Shutter in the following words: "Forgiveness is not the cessation of God's wrath, which never began, which demanded no sacrifice of the blood of his best beloved Son before he could look with compassion upon the rest of his children; but it is the removal of those things in human character and conduct which make man look for wrath and expect it" (*Justice and Mercy,* p. 162). Again, "I want to tell you that there is not and cannot be any such thing in God as you and I understand by wrath" (*Ibid.,* p. 242). Such assertions, in the face of the express declarations of the Scriptures to the contrary, should in themselves be sufficient warning to the devout believer in God's Word against the teachings of Universalism.

C *To minimize Christ's sacrifice for sin is to minimize the greatness of His Person.* This minimizing of Christ's sacrifice naturally leads to a regarding of Christ Jesus as merely a created finite being. And, as a logical necessity, this latter, too, the objectors to the doctrine of the endlessness of future punishment are doing. Thus Dr. Shutter, whom we shall again

quote because his statements represent the teachings of Universalists in general, emphatically declares: "I do not preach to you Christ as very God,—not as the second person in the Trinity,—not as a sacrifice to appease the Almighty; but as our elder and greater Brother, in whom the Divine life of the Father was most fully manifested; our Teacher, Leader and Inspiration" (*Justice and Mercy*, p. 156).

Thus Universalism logically leads to Unitarianism, as Unitarianism necessarily leads to Universalism. Or, Universalism is logical Unitarianism, as, conversely, Unitarianism is logical Universalism. Then, although there are minor differences between them, why do not at least these two sects unite, or why is not the one or the other of them eliminated?

It would seem needless to give proofs for Christ's Deity, as this is taught in the prophecies of His coming, and in the entire New Testament. But as this central doctrine is being challenged, we shall give enough proof to show that this is the unmistakable doctrine of the Scriptures, regardless of what a few objectors may say to the contrary.

Every intelligent reader of the Bible must accept Christ's pre-existence, as taught in many passages, as for example in the following: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made. . . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us" (John 1:1-14); "Before Abraham was born, I am" (John 8:58). Nor can any one call in question Christ's sinlessness while here on earth, as clearly taught in the following passage: "For we have not a high priest that

cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Hebrews 4:15). See also John 8:46; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Hebrews 7:26; 1 Peter 2:21-22. And His present reign is equally clearly taught: "Who [Jesus Christ] is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him" (1 Pet. 3:22). See also such passages as Revelation 1:17-18. Moreover, to Christ the same as to God the Father the Scriptures ascribe divine names (John 1:23, with Isa. 40:3; and many other passages); divine works (John 1:3; Col. 1:16; Heb. 1:10; etc.); divine attributes (Matt. 28:18; Heb. 13:8; etc.); and divine worship (Phil. 2:10; Rev. 5:12-14; etc.). Surely, further arguments and citations to prove Christ's Deity will be unnecessary for the purpose in hand.

D *To attempt to shorten the duration of future retribution is, therefore, to deny Christ's Deity.* It can thus readily be seen why so many Universalists are led to a rejection of the Deity of Christ.

The Saviour's Deity gave to His sacrifice for man an infinite measure, and this infinite measure implies infinite guilt on the part of man and consequently eternal punishment. Thus the doctrine of an endless punishment for the wicked is so related to that of the atonement, and therefore to those of Christ's incarnation and Person, and indeed to all other associated doctrines, that to deny it is virtually to deny all.

Having shown that the eternity of future punishment is not only the true Scriptural doctrine but that it is also in no way contrary to reason, we shall proceed to a consideration of the much discussed and much misunderstood question as to the nature of future punishment.

CHAPTER VIII

THE NATURE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT

WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE LOST?

As to the nature of future punishment, there are various theories. And with reference to this point there is more latitude for differences of opinion than with reference to the other points already discussed. Upon those points the Scriptures are much more explicit, the meaning in some cases being so unmistakable as to warrant only one honest interpretation.

On the nature of future punishment we have but little direct and definite revelation, and human reason is not able to resolve these mysteries of the future world. Nor is it the purpose of Scripture to reveal everything to man. Indeed, many details are wisely withheld. Moreover, from the point of view of the material world we could not even understand a full revelation of so transcendent a fact of the spiritual world as the essential nature of future punishment. And such a revelation would probably be impossible, as the ultimate facts and truths of the spiritual world could not be revealed to us directly, but only by metaphor and analogy in terms of the natural world. It would be as impossible directly to reveal to us, in our present state, the essential nature of future punishment, as it would be impossible directly to reveal that of future blessedness, that of our celestial bodies of which St. Paul speaks (1 Cor. 15:37-44), or that of God Himself (Ex. 33:20;

John 1:18; Job 11:7; 26:14; Rom. 11:33). There are several elements of the nature of future punishment that are, however, more or less clearly revealed to us in the Word of God, though chiefly in metaphor and by implication. Some of these elements are of a negative or privative, and some of a positive, nature.

I ELEMENTS OF A NEGATIVE NATURE

According to the Word of God, the wicked will be separated from the righteous. That separation will take place, as to their souls, immediately after death, as is taught in Luke 16:22-31: "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and that he was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom. . . . And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they that would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us." The wicked will thus be separated from the righteous between death and the general judgment. And at the general judgment, the separation will be made permanent or eternal and absolute, as the Saviour explicitly declares in Matthew 25:32-46: "And before him shall be gathered all the nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels . . . And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life." See also Matthew 8:11-12; 13:49;

22:13; 25:30. And, moreover, we are taught that the condemned sinner will not even receive any sympathy from the blessed, as it is written, "The righteous also shall see it, and fear, and shall laugh at him" (Ps. 52:6); "The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance" (Ps. 58:10).

In addition to this separation, there is another, and even worse, separation. The wicked will be separated from the presence of God and His glory; and this also will be true of them both between death and the resurrection and after the final judgment. This is also very evident from the passages quoted above, to which we might add 2 Thessalonians 1:9: "Who [that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ] shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might." This separation is also to last forever, not in non-existence but in full consciousness of being, and is therefore spoken of in the last quotation as a punishment with "everlasting destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might." It is to be where the sinner's own wilful separation from God in this world will have been made permanent by Him whom the sinner rejected and whose pleadings for repentance he despised. It is to be where God's light and love and beneficent laws are absent and therefore give no cheer and hope (Matt. 8:12; 22:13; 25:30). It is to be deprived of the enrapturing and transforming vision of God—God in Christ and Christ in God—and of the unspeakable joy of a better, because immediate, knowledge of His glorious Being.

This separation is therefore to exist forever without the supreme pleasure expressed or implied in such passages as the following, which, however, in our confined

mortal life altogether transcend our most exalted conceptions: "Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is" (1 John 3:2); "Father, I desire that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world" (John 17:24); "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me" (John 14:11); "For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know fully even as also I was fully known" (1 Cor. 13:12); "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (John 17:3).

Such separation from the righteous and from God means not only that the sinner is deprived of, or absent from, all good, but also that against him is arrayed every law of an otherwise gracious God. And no mercy or pity from a to him hitherto merciful God will go out toward the sinner, as is intimated in Proverbs 1: 26-32: "I also will laugh in the day of your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh," etc. Such negative punishment is in itself inexpressibly terrible, and its contemplation should constitute a sufficient solemn warning to every unrepentant sinner. The possibility of a future separation from God and the blessed, from all love and light and real life, should be enough to make even the most daring criminal halt in his career.

II ELEMENTS OF A POSITIVE NATURE

The negative elements spoken of above may be considered as constituting only the *condition* of future

punishment in its essential *positive* nature, or its dismal *periphery.*

1 OBJECTIVE

Not only will the wicked be banished from God and the good of both men and angels, but they will be condemned to be together. And *after the judgment* their abode will be with the devil and his angels, as is stated in different places, as for example in Matthew 25:41: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels." See also Revelation 20:10. Those of Satanic character, called also by Christ *sons of hell* (*Gehenna,* Matt. 23:15), will appropriately be consigned to the company of devils to share with them their diabolical abode. Thus not only will they be deprived of all the unspeakable joys and pleasures of heaven, but they will be doomed to the inexpressible anguish of hell *(Gehenna).* As to this point, many passages of Scripture already cited, especially in the first chapter, are very explicit.

(1) Expressions or Terms Used

In Christ's account of the judgment the wicked are called *cursed* (Matthew 25:41). Their post-judgment state is variously spoken of as one of *eternal punishment* (Matt. 25:46); of *judgment of hell* (*Gehenna,* Matt. 23:33). They are said to be cast into *outer darkness,* where there shall be *the weeping and the gnashing of teeth* (Matt. 8:12:22:13; 25:30); into *the furnace of fire,* where there shall be *the weeping and the gnashing of teeth* (Matt. 13:42 and 50). Their abode is further described as one of *eternal fire which*

is prepared for the devil and his angels (Matt. 25:41); as the *hell (Gehenna) of fire* (Matt. 5:22); as hell *(Gehenna), where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched* (Mark 9:43-48).

Very expressive also are such passages as these: "He [any man who worshippeth the beast] also shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is prepared unmixed in the cup of his anger; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb," etc. (Rev. 14:10-14); "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where are also the beast and the false prophet; and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20:10; see also Rev. 19:20; *et al.*). These declarations about the punishment of the devil and wicked men after the final judgment are unmistakable as to its terribleness. So also what is apparently the abode of the wicked from death to the resurrection of the body is spoken of as a place of torments in flames (Luke 16: 23-28—*Hades*; etc.). Other terms or descriptive passages might be cited not only from the New Testament, but also from the Old Testament; but these citations are sufficient for our present purpose.

(2) Meaning of These Terms

What these terms and expressions about the terrible place and state of the condemned really mean, no one can tell with any degree of certainty. They are no doubt highly metaphorical, as only in figure could any ideas of such transcendant things be conveyed to our sense-bound finite minds, as explained in the first and seventh chapters. But in employing terms or expressions which in the language of this material world are

expressive of, or associated with, the acutest agony of mind or body, the Saviour and His apostles meant to give such a description of the future punishment of the wicked as would convey at least some idea of its terribleness.

No one should, however, affirm that that punishment in the future world will consist in a literal burning by fire, such as we know in this grossly material world, as some have held and taught. To do so would be to pretend to understand and explain the ultimate essence of things in the supernatural sphere, which in Scripture are set forth only in the metaphorical language of the natural sphere. Indeed, the facts that the fallen angels, who are pure spirits, share in that punishment, and that that fire is said not to consume, are against the theory of such a literal burning. That it is not a literal earthly fire must therefore appear almost certain from the very nature of fire and the nature of the future world as revealed in the Word of God.

On the other hand, no one should deny the possibility that that punishment may be associated with something at least analogous to fire in this world, though very different in nature and phenomena. To do so would also be to pretend a knowledge of the nature of things spiritual, or of spiritual substance, totally unwarranted by any human science, as well as by Scripture. Indeed we really know nothing of the ultimate nature and constitution of things in that as yet unseen and unknown spiritual, and therefore, transcendent, world.

The figurative nature of the language of Scripture on this point is therefore apparent. But we cannot lose sight of the fact that it is such as to convey the

idea that what is thus said of the future world is more or less *analogous* to what we know in the present world or course of nature. At any rate, the descriptions of the punishment of the wicked are so realistic that it should preclude at least any dogmatism on the part of those who do not believe in the reality of this positive element of future punishment. It is an incontrovertible fact that, whatever its nature, this element of future punishment is everywhere described as *real* and *agonizing*.

2 SUBJECTIVE

In addition to those objective elements so unmistakably real and positive, whatever their transcendent nature, there are other elements that are *subjective*, though no less positive and real. The words "Son, remember," to the rich man (Luke 16:25), suggest what is undoubtedly true in this respect of every condemned sinner, not only before but also after the judgment. The sinner will be *fully conscious* and will *remember* (Luke 16:23-30); and, in the identity of his personality in this world and in the next, his *I* or *mine* or *me* hereafter will be the same as his *I* or *mine* or *me* here. Not only will he recognize this great fact, but he will also be conscious of, or remember and know, his personality in its *completeness*. His past will thus be ever present in the developed character of his own being. Without a doubt,

> "There no shade can last
> In that deep dawn behind the tomb,
> But clear from marge to marge shall bloom
> The eternal landscape of the past."
>
> (Tennyson: *In Memoriam*)

The memories of grace rejected and opportunities lost will vividly flash upon him in all their terrible reality. Perhaps the fruitless pleadings and providences of God, and the repeated warnings, in this life, will then rise up before the sinner as testimony against him. He will then also see and understand more fully the magnitude of sins committed against God and man and their dire effects, both upon others and upon himself, as well as upon the universal order. The utter folly of sinning against the infinite and long-suffering God must become apparent in all its immeasurable greatness, and all hope of escape from his condition under the righteous judgment of God will then have vanished. The words of the Psalmist could appropriately then also come from the lips of the condemned sinner:

"Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?
If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there:
If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, thou art there.
If I take the wings of the morning,
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;
Even there shall thy hand lead me,
And thy right hand shall hold me.
If I say, Surely the darkness shall overwhelm me,
And the light about me shall be night;
Even the darkness hideth not from thee,
But the night shineth as the day:
The darkness and the light are both alike to thee"
(Ps. 139:7-12).

The condemned will, moreover, be filled with inexpressible remorse. They are spoken of as weeping, etc. See Matthew 8:12; 13:42 and 50; 22:13; 24:51;

25:30; also such passages as Luke 16:19-31. Conscience, which had been lulled to sleep by a life of worldliness here, will there, in the light of unfailing memory, be very much alive and recoil with unspeakable horror and anguish. The justice of God's wrath upon sin, and of the sinner's punishment, must force itself upon the sinner with irresistible power.

The consciousness that all possibility of repentance and salvation is gone and that his state of punishment is final and absolute and the gulf that separates him from God and the blessed and all good, *fixed*, will add to the sinner's anguish (Luke 13:28; *et al.*). His character also will then be fixed, except that it may possibly tend to degenerate toward yet deeper evil and ruin.

But as there will be different degrees of glory to the blessed (Dan. 12:3; Matt. 5:19; 19:28; Luke 12:47-48; 19:12-26; 22:88-30; etc.), so also will there be different degrees of punishment, both objective and subjective, to the condemned. These will be in accordance with the greatness and nature of sins committed and the developed character. Thus Jesus declares: "And that servant, who knew his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. And to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom they commit much, of him will they ask the more" (Luke 12:47-48). See also Matthew 11:24; 16:27; 23:15; Luke 10:12; 20:47; Rev. 2:23; 22:12; etc. Additional points on what is discussed above will be found in the chapter on *Probationism*.

Such is the picture of the future punishment of the

wicked, drawn chiefly from the teachings of the loving and merciful Saviour Himself. It plainly shows the utter folly and the unspeakable consequences of a life of worldliness and sin. It illustrates or confirms what is said in Hebrews 10:31, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Moreover, the consequences are seen to follow the sinner's own wilful rejection of grace and his transgression or abuse of otherwise beneficent law. The sinner is thus alone responsible for his own lost condition, as it is written, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Gal. 6:7).

It has not been a very agreeable task to point out in the foregoing chapters the errors—some of them very subtle and yet perhaps all the more dangerous—in the teachings of eminent and apparently well-meaning men. Nor has it even been more agreeable to set forth in this chapter the undeniable teaching of the Scriptures as to the punishment that will hereafter be meted out to sinners unrepentant here. We have done so only in the interests, and for the vindication, of the truth as unmistakably taught by Christ and His blessed apostles and as we reverently accept and believe it. And if we have succeeded, by the grace of God, in leading earnest inquirers to the truth as to this solemn subject, as well as in warning heedless persons from a life that would inevitably lead to the unhappy end pointed out in this chapter, we shall consider our humble labors richly rewarded, to the glory of our infinitely merciful, and yet equally just, eternal God.

CHAPTER IX

THE NATURE OF FUTURE BLESSEDNESS

WHAT IS THE STATE OF THE SAVED?

It is refreshing to turn from the discussion of the state of the lost to a consideration of the blessedness of the saved. This is a subject that comes close to many an anxious heart. Nor has interest in it perhaps ever been keener than during and since the late War. To many a fond father and tender mother whose son fell in the service of his country, questions like the following have come unbidden: Is his state in the spiritual world one of conscious blessedness? Does he remember us and the associations of his life while on earth? Is it well with our boy? Yes, and so concerned are many about their departed loved ones that they would even through so-called spiritistic mediums seek the desired information. There is many a Sir Oliver Lodge who is anxious to look behind the veil that separates our world from that of a departed Raymond.

Fortunately we are not left entirely in ignorance as to the state of the sainted dead. We need not resort to forbidden means to attain such knowledge as is well for us to have. We need not listen to any unauthorized, uncertain or ambiguous voice from the spirit world. There is a voice which all who hear may recognize as the voice of truth. It is the voice of Him who knows because it is the voice of God. And when God speaks

on so transcendent a subject, even though He uses the instrumentality of human lips or the hands of human scribes, His word is with an authority that is final and should therefore gratefully be accepted by all that claim to be His children. Of course, many things that might satisfy our *curiosity* and that of themselves might be interesting to know, He has not revealed. But enough is made known to us to guide us in our course through this world on our journey to that other world: more is not required.

Some of the elements in the blessedness of the saved have already been foreshadowed in the previous chapters, in connection with our consideration of the state of the lost. We shall now set forth more in detail what has been revealed on this great subject.

I NO INTERMEDIATE STATE OF UNCONSCIOUSNESS

We have already shown that neither for the unrighteous nor for the righteous is there an intermediate state of unconsciousness or so-called sleep until the time of the resurrection of the body and its reunion with the soul. Neither is there any intermediate place of mere neutral waiting for good and bad alike until the resurrection; nor is there any so-called *limbus patrum* or *limbus infantum*. And that there is no state of temporal punishment for such as are supposedly finally to be saved is set forth at length in the fifth chapter. But as the souls of the lost at death pass immediately into a state of misery in the other world, as we have shown, so do the souls of the saved pass immediately into one of blessedness. Lazarus died and was carried immediately into Abraham's bosom; the thief on the cross passed into the spiritual world and met Jesus *that*

day in Paradise; or, in general, for the redeemed to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord, to be where Christ is. It is to pass into a state that has appropriately been characterized as one of life, of life that is everlasting. Yes, it is thus literally true that he that believeth in Christ, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in Christ shall never die.

It is, moreover, a state of *full* consciousness, not one of a semi-consciousness in which the soul would somehow make itself felt by the spirits of the living in this world and communicate to them in a vague manner a dim revelation of the other world and of its own dreamlike condition. No, it is a state in which conscious personal identity continues, in which memory endures. "Son, remember," were the words spoken to the rich man in Hades; and these words, which imply that the conscious personality of the lost persists and that memory lives on, might equally have been addressed to Lazarus in Abraham's bosom. There is no so-called reabsorption into an hypothetical general soul. Thus there is perhaps as much truth as poetry in the suggestive words of Tennyson,

> "There no shade can last
> In that deep dawn behind the tomb,
> But clear from marge to marge shall bloom
> The eternal landscape of the past."

The memory of having helped on to the road toward the light, toward salvation through the crucified Redeemer, some fellow-pilgrim on life's pilgrimage, will no doubt be an element in the composite joy and bless-

edness of the saved. The memory of a life of service, the consciousness of the far-reaching blessed outworkings of good deeds done and the fruitage of kind words spoken and warning admonitions given, must prove an unspeakable satisfaction and joy.

II MORE DIRECT KNOWLEDGE AND BETTER UNDERSTANDING

It will be a state in which the departed will know, at least in a measure, some of the mysteries of God, of His greatness and of His wondrous works and especially of His providential dealings with themselves. "For now we see in a mirror darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know fully even as also I was fully known" (I Cor. 13:12). With "larger, other eyes," the redeemed will see and understand how God has led them all their life long through this world of probation and preparation. And they may, for all we know, even be vouchsafed some knowledge of God's dealings with their friends in this world and of the ongoings in His Kingdom. This does not mean that the sainted dead will know everything, but that as far as their knowledge will extend it will no doubt be inerrant. Surely, such a prospect in the future world should be of inexpressible interest to every seeker after truth and knowledge here on earth. With what joy will not a Melanchthon, a Luther, a Calvin, and others of their class, understand more about the subjects that here so engaged their attention, subjects like the Incarnation, redemption and the Holy Trinity! Indeed, this is one of the elements of future blessedness for which Melanchthon thought it better to die than to continue to live. With what rapture may not even the reverent

man of science, the enthusiastic student of the Almighty's wondrous creation, in immediate vision behold and rejoice in the glorious handiwork of his Father and his God! Without the aid of telescope or microscope or other instruments of investigation, yea even of any calculus, he may directly see and understand some of the mysteries which here in vain he tried to fathom. A delightful occupation of the glorified might even be,

III FUTURE RECOGNITION AND FELLOWSHIP

"To wander up and down the heavens of space
With flight of thought and with an angel's sight
To read creation's story, and to trace
God's plans for aeons through those realms of light!"
Ad Astra (L. F. G.)

There will no doubt also be a recognition of each other on the part of those who have passed through this world together, even as is illustrated in the case of the rich man and Lazarus. And this will, of course, also be true after the resurrection and the General Judgment. Nor will there be any sorrow, neither before nor after the resurrection, for such as may be missed among the company of the saved, as we have already shown somewhat at length. There will be full recognition of, and acquiescence in, God's justice in the case of the unsaved. The soul's will must have been conformed to God's will. The redeemed will love only what God loves. In the future world family relationships, so necessary in this world, will have been superseded by the higher relationship of children to a common Father and of brethren to one another. There they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are

as the angels of God; and this will be true both of the pre-resurrection life and also of the post-resurrection life. And yet, although the saints will not be distributed into families as they are here, there is a sense in which it may be said that the mother may find her long-lost child, and that the blessed will be in the presence of those whom they loved. Moreover, not only will the saved recognize those who were their immediate associates in this life, but it may be inferred from the account of the transfiguration of Jesus, according to which the three favored disciples beheld and immediately recognized Moses and Elijah, that they will recognize the saints of other ages, the great and good that will shine as the stars forever and ever. And the fellowship of the saints will be another element in the joy and satisfaction of the redeemed. There will be Adam and Noah and Abraham and Moses and Ruth and David and Elijah and Isaiah and John and Paul and Mary and Athanasius and Augustine and Luther and the other mighty men and women of God. And with what absorbing interest can they not tell the story of God's providence in their lives and in the secessive epochs of the history of the world! Perhaps Tennyson's words are not wholly untrue,

"And we shall sit at endless feast,
Enjoying each the other's good."

But the blessed will not be equal in their knowledge and understanding of the things of God, for surely different individuals will have different capacities and some will have advanced farther than others in their progress in the truth.

IV SATISFYING ACTIVITY AND CONSEQUENT DEVELOPMENT

This brings us to another element in the blessedness of the saved. Theirs will not be a state of mere inaction, but one in which there will be satisfying activity and consequent development. There will no doubt be continually new revelations of what God is and of what Christ is and has done for the blessed, as there will be ever new capacities for knowing and loving God. And this will probably be true in the pre-resurrection life of the soul, as well as in the post-resurrection life of the reunited soul and glorified body. And for this fact even nature apparently affords some evidence, as we have elsewhere indicated. "We believe, and are convinced, that the evidence from nature, as well as the evidence from the human heart, is wholly in accord with the evidence from the Christian Scriptures, that the physical universe is the colossal . . . scaffolding spoken into being by the Almighty for the working out of a higher *spiritual* purpose. And that purpose is undoubtedly the development of the even more glorious spiritual kingdom, or spiritual universe, in which glorified men and seraphic intelligences may dwell and enjoy the revelations of His love and the unutterable glory of His unfathomable infinite Being forever. Man's powers are developing with almost a prophetic consciousness toward some great final goal; and we may devoutly believe that they are perhaps even fitting him better to understand and to appreciate the glories and complexities of the world beyond, where in God's higher spiritual universe they may continue to develop throughout eternity, yet forever incommensurable with the capacities of his God" (*Whence Came the Universe?* p. 275).

Yes, the future life will be a life of service; but service will be without weariness: it will be the service of love and joy. "The redeemed are said to be destined to stand 'before the throne, and before the Lamb;' and there they may reveal unto the rest of created intelligences the love of their common Father in the sacrifice of His Son, as those who 'came out of great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. . . . And we may reverently believe that they may be the only competent beings to declare the story of eternal love in Calvary to the sinless creatures which may people other realms and perhaps countless millions of worlds that dot the map of God's magnificent empire." (*Whence Came the Universe?* p. 276).

V THE GLORY OF THE REDEEMED

The future will, moreover, be a state of glory, of glory that is inexpressible. The sense-bound human mind here cannot conceive of, nor can language developed only for the needs of this world express, the glory of the redeemed. This is so by the very nature of the case and cannot but be recognized by all thinkers alike, even if we had no direct revelation of that fact. With enraptured vision they shall behold God. "Therefore are they before the throne of God; and they serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall spread his tabernacle over them" (Rev. 7:15). We are to be children of God, and in the words of St. Paul, "and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified with him. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall

be revealed to us-ward" (Rom. 8:17 and 18). The redeemed shall be with Christ and behold His glory and shall become more and more like Him. "We all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (II. Cor. 3:18). Indeed, among the most wonderful and eloquent passages in the New Testament Scriptures are those in which the Apostles speak of the glory of the redeemed; and in these passages we have intimations of various elements, and a wide range of glory.

But the glory of the redeemed and the joy that will be theirs will not be complete until after the resurrection and the General Judgment, when the body which is the instrument of the soul on earth will share in the same with that soul in the final heaven of the blessed. The deeds of life here will then have had their full outworkings, especially those which had their effects upon the lives of others. The impress of every individual upon this world will then be completed and the final accounting at the General Judgment will give the measure to the rewards of the righteous. Indeed, these will not be distributed until the Judgment. The resurrection bodies will have new properties and endowments. The glorified body will be transfigured by the regenerated indwelling soul. "And death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more: the first things are passed away" (Rev. 21: 4). "They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun strike upon them, nor any heat: for the Lamb that is in the midst of the throne shall be their shepherd, and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life: and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes" (Rev. 7:16 and 17).

VI DIFFERENT DEGREES OF GLORY

But there will be different degrees of glory. It is true that all the saved will be alike in so far as they share in a common salvation. But even as individuals here are not alike in their capacities to love, know and serve and in their potentialities, and yet live in and share a common world, so also will they hereafter differ in glory, although they share a common salvation and a common heaven. They will occupy different positions in that same Kingdom of glory, even as here they do in the same world of grace. Salvation, in which all the redeemed share alike, may be called the condition of the glory in degrees of which they differ. That there are degrees of glory and differences in rewards among the blessed was already quite clearly taught in the Old Testament. Thus we are told, "And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" (Dan. 12:3). And Jesus said to the disciples, "Verily I say unto you, that ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19:28). Thus some will occupy more exalted positions and will be, as it were, nearer their Lord; and their relative positions will depend upon their services for good, for God and man, especially in bringing others into the kingdom of their Master. It is *faithfulness* here that counts in the distribution of the rewards, as illustrated in the parable of the pounds. He who had been faithful in making his pound gain ten other pounds was given authority over ten cities, and he who had made his pound gain five pounds was given authority over five cities. Thus as "one star

differeth from another star in glory," so will the saints of God differ in the great hereafter.

And yet all will be equally satisfied, for each will receive according to his capacity to receive and to use. If two persons, one a highly trained musician and the other simply an average lover of music, attend the same concert, both are thrilled and satisfied. And yet the former has a relatively greater appreciation of the wonderful harmonies of sound than the other, because of his greater capacity to receive and understand them. They are both equally satisfied, but with a different measure of what may be enjoyed. Two persons may be thirsty for a refreshing drink of pure water. The one may drink twice as much as the other, and yet they are both equally satisfied; nor would the latter in the least envy the former, because he received all he could enjoy.

VII HEAVEN A PLACE, AS WELL AS A STATE

But the erroneous conclusion must not be drawn that heaven is only a state without a locus as a background. Jesus calls it His Father's house of many mansions (John 14:2). It is, moreover, described as a city which hath foundations, whose Maker and Builder is God (Heb. 11:10), or the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:2). It is to be an everlasting *home.* It is where Christ is (Phil. 1:23). It is a place of purity, where sin cannot enter, and where the wicked cease from troubling. Thus in many passages of Scripture it is clearly taught that heaven is a *place,* which is adapted to the state of the blessed described above; and that place may also have a reciprocal bearing upon that state.

The contention on the part of some thinkers that

heaven can be only a state or a condition, is based upon the fact that a spirit as such cannot strictly be localized or be said to occupy or be confined by space. But the exponents of this theory apparently either ignore the reality of the resurrection body, or regard it as a purely spiritual entity. It is true that the resurrection body is probably not atomically identical with the body in this physical world, and yet it retains at least the identity of personality. Yes, that body may be said to be spiritual, because of spiritual properties in its new state and of attributes due to its indwelling glorified spirit. But why speculate as to the nature of bodies in the future world, when we do not even know their ultimate nature in this world, for the latest science reduces all materiality to energy? And yet, that energy-constituted material world occupies space. And what is space in its relation to matter even here, when space itself is only a relation and is determined by so-called matter, according to recent science?

But it has been contended that at least between death and the resurrection of the body there can be no locus for the soul as a disembodied spirit. But what we have said above as to place or space should itself suggest the need of modesty in making any dogmatic statement even as to that long period before the resurrection. Indeed, as is held by many thinkers now, space and time are so related that they must necessarily exist together. And thus an entity that would be spaceless would also needs be timeless. However, St. Paul speaks of an ethereal body (II Cor. 5) with which we are to be clothed, so that no one can absolutely declare that the soul will even then be without some locus, however ethereal in nature. Thus it would be presumptuous to declare that the human spirit will ever

be wholly without an organ of action in some way analogous to that through which it operates in this world. Hence the future world between death and the resurrection would also have to be a place, whatever its nature might be.

It is hardly necessary to say, in closing this discussion, that many points could not be developed within the compass of these pages. Many of the reader's questions have no doubt been left unanswered, while others may have been suggested to him in the course of his reading. But enough has perhaps been said as to what will not and what will be the state of the lost in the great hereafter, as well as what will be the state of the saved, to afford a correct understanding of the undoubted teaching of the Scriptures on this very interesting subject. And where certain details have not been given, the proper approach to a correct answer of Scripture as to such details, may readily be deduced. Some points, especially such as the nature of the resurrection body, future blessedness, and heavenly recognition, have been given more or less only in outline. Much more space might have been devoted to these, but the aim has been, as far as possible, to set forth what is more definitely revealed and thus to avoid what is more speculative. Moreover, to do justice to these points, even if in a more speculative vein, a second volume should be devoted to them alone. The present contribution in support of the Scriptural teaching as to man in the future world is therefore brought to a close, with the hope and prayer that it may prove a blessing to many on their journey thither and that it may thus redound to the glory of God.

INDEX

Abraham's Bosom, 23.
Activity, as part of joy of redeemed, 237, 238.
Annihilationism, 27ff.
    John Locke, Archbishop Whately, Rothe, exponents of, 27;
    Buechner, Fuerbach, Moleschott, Fichte, Strauss, Spinoza, exponents of philosophic, 28, 29;
    penal, 30ff.;
    properly so called. 37ff.;
    argument for, fallacious, 40ff.
Apostolic Succession, papal, a historic figment, 122.
Aquinas, Thomas, on purgatory, 91.
Athanasius, against theory of universal salvation, 141.
Atonement by Christ, urged in defense of universal salvation, 145ff;
    argument for universal salvation from, answered, 158ff.
Augustine, on some purgatorial fire, 97;
    against theory of universal salvation, 141.
Auricular Confession, 124, 125;
    Catechism of Perseverance and Council of Trent on, 124.
Balfour, Rev. Walter, exponent of universalism, 142.
Ballou, Rev. Hosea, father of modern universalism, 142.
Bellarmine, on purgatory, 87, 88, 92;
    on papal infallibility, 126.
Blessedness, nature of future, 231ff;
    one of full consciousness, 232, 233;
    one of more direct knowledge and better understanding, 234, 235;
    one of fellowship, 235, 236;
    one of satisfying activity, 237, 238.
Bonaventura, on purgatory, 91.
Buechner, an exponent of philosophic annihilationism, 28.
Catchism of Perseverance, on purgatory, 88, 92, 93;
    on source of indulgences, 115;
    on auricular confession, 124;
    on prayers for the dead, 131.
Chance, "fair," question of, considered, 67ff.
Children, unbaptized, no future probation necessary for, 62.
Christian Science, illustrating Satan's approach and method, 190.
Clement of Alexandria, on some purgatorial fire, 91;
    an early exponent of universal salvation, 141ff.
Concessions, of exponents of universal salvation, 182ff.
Conditional immortality, 31ff.;
    Scriptures cited in proof of, 32, 33;
    answer to theory of, 33ff.
Confession, auricular, 124, 125.
Consciousness, of soul after death, 52ff., 232, 233.
Continued being, for both righteous and unrighteous, 45;

for both righteous and unrighteous, of equal duration, 46;
for both righteous and unrighteous, a fully conscious one, 46;
in punishment, not inconsistent with God's love, 48.
Creation, purpose of, 237.
Creed, gradual development of Apostles', 177.
Death, a dissolution or separation, 44;
physical, a separation of soul from body, 44;
spiritual, a separation from God, 44;
eternal, a separation from God that is eternal, 44.
Death and destruction, meaning of terms, 40ff.
Degrees, different, of glory and of punishment, 229, 241.
Deharbe, on indulgences, 114;
on applying of indulgences to souls in purgatory, 114, 115.
Deity, proofs for Christ's, 218, 219.
Destiny, fixed at death, 79, 82ff.
Destruction and death, meaning of terms, 40ff.
Doctrines, many questioned in early Church, 176ff.
Dorner, on possible offer of salvation in future world, 151;
answer to, 152, 153;
not in sympathy with Universalism as a sect, 153;
interpretation of Revelation by, 173, 174.
Dunkers, early, of Pennsylvania, taught universal restoration, 142.

Encyclopedia, Catholic, on purgatory, 90, 96, 97, 99;
on power of keys and indulgences, 118.
Eternalism 195ff.
accepted by ancient Jews, 200ff.;
taught by Christ, 202;
taught by the apostles, 202;
not contrary to reason, 203;
involved in nature of sin, 204;
objections as to, answered, 206ff.;
necessitated by other doctrines, 212ff.;
necessitated by nature and greatness of sin, 212ff.;
necessitated by Christ's atoning sacrifice, 215ff.;
necessitated by Deity of Christ, 217ff.
Eternity, how expressed, 198;
inadequacy of language directly to express idea of, 199.
Evil, persistence in, 205.

Fagnini, Prospero, on pope's authority, 126.
"Fair" chance, question of, considered, 67ff.
Faith, salvation only by, 68.
Farrar, on future probation, 72;
answer to Farrar's argument for future probation, 73;
followed by Shutter, 72;
on persistence in evil, 205;
against conditional immortality, 205.
Fathers, alleged evidence for purgatory from, 96, 97.

Fellowship, an element in joy of the blessed, 235, 236.
Ferrara-Florence, Council of, on purgatory, 86, 92.
Fichte, Spinoza, Strauss, exponents of philosophic annihilationism, 28, 29.
Fixedness of character, tendency toward, an element against future probation, 82.
Freedom, human, of choice, not extended to future world, 154, 155.
Future punishment, belief in, universal, 10;
not inconsistent with God's love, 10, 48;
Dr. Phelps on, 11.

Gehenna, meaning of, 15, 16, 23, 24.
Gerson, in history of doctrine of purgatory, 91.
Gibbons, Cardinal, on purgatory, 89, 94ff.;
concedes purgatory not taught in Scripture, 105;
on indulgences, 113, 114;
on papal infallibility, 126;
on prayers for the dead, 130.
Glory, different degrees of, 229, 241;
of redeemed, 238;
of future life inconceivable in this life, 238, 239;
not complete till after resurrection and judgment, 239.
Goodness, of God, urged in defense of universal salvation, 145ff.;
argument from, not valid, 146ff.;
argument from, answered by Christ and apostles, 155, 156.
Government, by law, 9ff.;
in future world, 10.
Grace, day of, ended with death, 78ff.
Gregory, the Great, teaching concerning purgatory at time of, 91.
Gruber, on the soul, 29;
on possible occupation of the redeemed, 235, 238;
on purpose of creation and glory of the redeemed, 237.

Hades, meaning of term, 21-23;
as a translation of Sheol, 21;
as a place of retribution between death and resurrection, 22.
Heathen, no future probation necessary for, 61, 62, 69, 70.
Heaven, a place, as well as a state, 241, 242.
Human satisfactions, in proof of purgatory, 107ff.;
Wiseman on, in proof of purgatory, 107, 109.

Immortality, of soul, points in proof of, 37, 38.
Indulgences, closely related to doctrine of purgatory, 113;
Cardinal Gibbons on, 113, 114;
Deharbe on, 114, on application of, to souls in purgatory, 114, 115;

Wiseman on, 114;
Lepecier, on application of, to souls in purgatory, 114, 115;
Spirago-Clarke on application of, to souls, 115;
Catechism of Perseverance on source of, 115;
Kinane on reciprocal blessings from, 116;
Council of Trent on, 116;
summary of argument against, 117ff.;
basis of, in power of keys, 118.
Infallibility, papal, Fagnini, Poitiers, *et al.*, on, 126, 127;
whole argument for, based upon false premises, 128, 129.
Intermediate state, no, common to spirits of saved and of lost, 23.
Jewish belief, as to duration of punishment, 200ff.
Judgment, general, for both righteous and unrighteous, 45.
Justice, of God, argument for universal salvation from, 168ff.

King, Thomas Starr, admission as to universal salvation by, 183.
Knowledge, more direct in future world, 234, 235;
factor of, in salvation, 68.
Kunze, G., an exponent of conditional immortality, 31.
Language, phenomenal nature of, 195ff.;
as used by inspired writers, 196;
by adaptations, etc., used with new meanings, 196ff.;
inadequacy of, directly to express ideas of eternity, etc., 196, 199.
Law, all things governed by, 9;
life here governed by, 10;
written on heart, 69.
Lepecier, on application of indulgences to souls in purgatory, 114, 115.
Liturgies, of the Church, alleged evidence for purgatory from, 98.
Locke, John, an exponent of annihilationism, 21.

Maccabees, Second, in proof of purgatory, 93, 95;
of no weight as proof of purgatory, 133.
Martin, on purgatory, 102, 103, 104.
Memory, as an element of future punishment, 227, 228.
Moleschott, an exponent of philosophic annihilationism, 28.
Murray, Rev. James, early authority for universalism, 142.
Müller, Julius, on possible future offer of salvation, 151.

Necessity, philosophic, urged in defense of universalism, 167, 168.

Omnipotence, of God, urged in defense of universal salvation, 161ff.;
argument for universal salvation from, not valid, 162ff.
Opportunities, unequal, 66.
Origen, on some purgatorial fire, 91.

Paradise, 23.

Penance, in proof of purgatory, 108, 109;
Wiseman on, in proof of purgatory, 108;
Catechism of Perseverance on, in proof of purgatory, 109.
Peter, not pope of Rome, 121, 122.
Phelps, Dr. Austin, on doctrine and certainty of future punishment, 11.
Plato, on a purgatorial fire, 90.
Poitiers, Bishop, on papal infallibility, 127.
Pope, supremacy of, 119;
Wiseman on, 119, 122;
Wilhelm & Scannell on, 119;
no Scriptural or historic foundation for, as successor of St. Peter, 121;
Deharbe, Spirago-Clarke, Cardinal Gibbons, Bellarmine, and Freeman's Catholic Register, on infallibility of, 125, 126.
Power, of keys, the foundation of indulgences, 118;
Wiseman and Catholic Encyclopedia on, 118;
alleged basis of, 120;
meaning of, 122, 123.
Prayers, for dead, Cardinal Gibbons, Wiseman, Catechism of Perseverance, Lepecier, Kinane, on, 130, 131.
Preaching, Christ's, in spiritual world, not the Gospel unto salvation, 74ff.
Probation, future, no, for heathen and unbaptized children, 63, 64.
argument for, fallacious, 63ff.;
no, for the impenitent, 70ff.;
this life the only period for, 71;
ceases with death, 71;
Farrar on, 72;
Scriptures quoted for, not applicable, 76ff.
Probationism, 61ff.;
reason for theory of, 61;
disproved by Scripture, 77ff.
Psychopannychism, 51ff.;
meaning of term, 51;
alleged Scriptural evidence for, 51ff.;
the dead spoken of as *asleep*, 51ff.;
the dead spoken of as *at rest*, 53ff.;
misapplication of Scripture for, 52ff.;
other Scriptural evidence against, 55ff.;
founded upon false premises, 58.
Punishment, future, unequal, 65, 66;
nature of, 220ff.;
difficulty of revealing nature of, 220;
of a negative nature, 221ff.;
in separation from righteous, 221;
in separation from God, 222;
in separation from all good, 223;
of a positive nature, 223ff.;
terms used to describe, 224ff.;

of a subjective character, 227ff.;
memory as an element in, 227, 228;
remorse as an element of, 228;
different degrees of, 229.
Purgationism, 85ff.
Purgatory, authoritative statement of doctrine of, 85ff.:
Council of Florence on, 86, 92;
Bellarmine on, 87, 88, 92;
Kinane on, 88, 96, 104;
Catechism of Perseverance on, 88, 92, 93;
Spirago-Clarke on, 88;
Wilhelm & Scannell on, 89, 100, 101;
Cardinal Gibbons on, 89, 94-97;
Catholic Encyclopedia on, 90, 96ff.;
history of doctrine of, 90-92;
Tertullian, Clement af Alexandria, Origen, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Aquinas, Bonaventura, Gerson, on, 91;
Rome's proofs for, 92ff.;
Second Maccabees in proof of, 93, 95;
sin against the Holy Ghost in proof of, 93, 95-97;
tradition of Catholic Church in proof of, 93, 97;
tradition of ancient sects in proof of, 93, 98;
tradition of pagans in proof of, 93;
proofs for, inadequate, 93ff.;
alleged evidence for, from the Fathers, 96, 97;
alleged evidence for, from liturgies, 98;
other speculative proofs for, 99ff.;
Wiseman on, 100, 133;
proofs for, a reasoning in a circle, 101;
Martin on, 102, 103;
not really taught in Scripture, according to Gibbons, Wiseman, Spirago-Clarke, Wilhelm & Scannell, 105, 106;
penance in proof of, 109;
Wiseman on human satisfactions and penance in proof of, 108, 109;
Catechism of Perseverance on human satisfactions in proof of, 109;
works of supererogation in proof of, 110, 111;
Wiseman on supererogation in proof of, 111;
indulges in proof of, 113ff.;
power of keys in proof of, 119ff.;
papal infallibility in proof of, 125ff.;
whole argument for, based upon false premises, 129, 132;
argument for, from doctrine and practice of praying for the dead, 130ff.;
direct evidence of Scripture against doctrine of, 132ff.;
Second Maccabees of no value as evidence for, 133;
early Fathers of no value as evidence for, 133;
salvation by faith in Christ's merits against doctrine of, 133, 134.

Recognition, future, an element in blessedness, 235, 236.

Reformers, on future punishment, 178.
Relly Rev. James, first American exponent of universalism, 142.
Remorse, an element in future punishment, 228.
Restorationism, theory of, 143.
Retribution, illustrated in nature, 9-11;
testimony of Scripture as to, 11ff.;
Old Testament on, 12, 13;
New Testament on, 13ff.;
Christ's teaching on, in parables, 14, 15;
Christ's direct teaching on, 15, 16;
other New Testament testimony on, 17.
Rewards, future, unequal, 64, 65.
Russell, "Pastor," theory of, untenable, 59, 75.

Satan, method of, in approach to soul, 189ff.
Sawyer, T. J., in correspondence with Tholuch, 154.
Schleiermacher, attitude of, toward universalism, 154, 209.
Shakespeare, on suicide, 186, 210.
Shedd, on danger of rejecting doctrine of eternalism, 212.
Sheol, meaning of term, 18-21.
Shutter, Marion D., on "fair" chance, 63, 64;
on terms hell and damnation, 74;
on subjugation of sinners, 165;
on universalism vs. eternalism, 175;
admission of, as to universal salvation, 183, 184;
on punishment and sin, 206;
on reality of sin, 213;
on resurrection and judgment, 214ff.;
on forgiveness, 217;
on Deity of Christ, 218.
Sin, against the Holy Ghost, in proof of purgatory, 93, 95, 97.
Soul, materialistic conception of, 28;
pantheistic conception of, 29;
not a function of body, 28;
points in proof of immortality of, 37, 38;
not asleep or unconscious after death, 51ff., 232, 233;
not dependent upon body for existence, 59.
Spirago-Clarke, on purgatory, 88;
on purgatory not being taught in Scripture, 106;
on applying indulgences to souls in purgatory, 115;
on papal infallibility, 126.
State of lost, 220ff.;
little revealed as to, 220;
difficulty of revealing, to man in present state, 220;
one of punishment, both positive and negative in nature, 221ff.
State of saved, 231ff.;
source of information, 231, 232;
one of consciousness immediately after death, 232, 234;
one of more direct knowledge and better understanding, 234, 235;

one of blessed fellowship, 235, 236.
Succession, apostolic, papal, a historic figment, 122.
Suicide, uncouraged by theory of universal salvation, 186;
Shakespeare on, 186, 210.
Supererogation, works of, in proof of purgatory, 110, 111;
Wiseman and Kinane on, in proof of purgatory, 111;
Scriptures against theory of, 112, 113.
Sympathy, of saved with the lost, argument for universal salvation from, 171, 172.

Tartarus, 24.
Tennyson, In Memoriam quoted, 29, 192, 228;
on final triumph of good, 192.
Terms, primary and derived meaning of, 17;
Sheol, 18-21;
Hades, 21-23;
Paradise, 23;
Abraham's Bosom, 23;
Gehenna, 23, 24;
Tartarus, 24.
Tertullian, on purgatorial fire, 91;
blamed for doctrine of eternalism, 175ff.
Tetzel, indulgences under, 117.
Tholuch, attitude toward universalism, 154.
Tradition, of Catholic Church, in proof of purgatory, 93, 97;
of ancient sects, in proof of purgatory, 93, 98;
of pagans, in proof of purgatory, 93.
Trent, Council of, on purgatory, 86, 87, 92;
on indulgences, 116;
on authority in forgiving sins, 123;
on necessity of confession, 124.

Unitarianism, Universalism as practical, 173;
leads to Universalism, 218.
Universalism, 141ff.;
history of, 141, 142;
Clement of Alexandria and Origen early exponents of, 141;
Athanasius and Augustine against theory of, 141;
modern exponents of, 142;
as a denomination, 142;
forms of, 143;
basis of theory of, 143;
arguments urged in defense of, 145ff.;
argument from God's goodness for, 145ff.;
Dorner and Julius Müller, on, 151;
Dorner not in sympathy with sect of, 152, 153;
Schliermacher and Tholuch not real exponents of, 154;
Christ's atonement in defense of, 156ff.;
omnipotence of God in defense of, 161ff.;
philosophic necessity in defense of, 167, 168;
justice of God in defense of, 168;
sympathy of saved with lost in defense of, 171ff.;

history and tradition as evidence for, 172-174;
and Scripture irreconcilable, 180;
disproved by its groundlessness and inherent weaknesses, 180ff.;
concessions by its exponents as to, 183ff.;
moral dangers involved in theory of, 185ff.;
not a religion for apostles and missionaries to preach, 187, 188;
akin to argument of Satan in Eden, 189ff.;
fundamental fallacies of, 191ff.;
essentially Unitarian, 193;
danger of holding theory of, 194;
leads to Unitarianism, 218.
Unrighteous, the, to have continued conscious being, 45, 46;
to share in resurrection and general judgment, 45, 46.

Waldron, A. J., admission as to universal salvation by, 184, 185.
White, Edward, an exponent of conditional immortality, 31.
Wilhelm & Scannell, on purgatory, 89, 100, 101;
on powers of keys, 19.
Wiseman, Cardinal, on purgatory, 100;
concedes purgatory not taught in Scripture, 105, 106;
on human satisfactions in proof of purgatory, 108;
on works of supererogation in proof of purgatory, 111;
on indulgences, 114;
on power of keys, 119, 122;
on prayers for the dead, 131, 132.
Words, as vessels of ideas, 17;
meaning of, in different ages and for different individuals, 17, 18.
Swingli, on sin as a bad habit, 213.
on works of supererogation in proof of purgatory, 111;
on indulgences, 114;
on power of keys, 119, 122;
on prayers for the dead, 131, 132.
meaning of, in different ages and for different individuals,

Date Due

D 14 '48			
DE 5 - '49			
DE 19 '49			
~~FEB 15 '60~~			
~~MAR 21 '60~~			
~~MAR 31 '76~~			

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01031 4666